

SURVEY OF STATE PORTAL INITIATIVES

Submitted to the Texas Electronic Government Task Force
By The Texas Department of Information Resources (DIR)

December 1999

Contributors: Phil Barrett, Eddie Esquivel, Larry Hutchison, Becky Lentz, Martha Richardson, Corrine Shepherd, Jennifer Walden, and Martha Zottarelli

Report is also available on line at: <http://www.dir.state.tx.us/egov/>

Informational Contacts:

Phil Barrett at phil.barrett@dir.state.tx.us or 1-512-475-4754

Eddie Esquivel at eddie.esquivel@dir.state.tx.us or 1-512-475-4735

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
INTRODUCTION.....	5
METHODOLOGY	6
ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT	6
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	7
SCOPE OF STATE PORTAL PROJECTS AND INITIATIVES.....	7
APPROACHES TO OVERSIGHT, GOVERNING AND MANAGEMENT OF PORTAL PROJECTS.....	8
STATUTORY FRAMEWORKS.....	8
PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.....	9
METHODS OF ASSESSING COSTS/BENEFITS.....	9
PORTAL SERVICES.....	10
METHODS OF HANDLING DATA SECURITY, DATA INTEGRITY, AND INFORMATION PRIVACY CONCERNS.....	11
END-USER NEEDS AND ACCESSIBILITY ISSUES.....	11
SURVEYED STATES AT-A-GLANCE.....	13
ARIZONA*	14
ARKANSAS*	16
CALIFORNIA	18
FLORIDA	20
GEORGIA*	22
IDAHO*	24
INDIANA*	26
IOWA*	28
KANSAS*	30
MAINE*	32
MASSACHUSETTS.....	34
MICHIGAN	37
MISSISSIPPI.....	39
NEBRASKA*	41
NEW YORK	43
OHIO.....	45
PENNSYLVANIA	47
UTAH*	49
VIRGINIA*	51
WASHINGTON	53
APPENDIX A: HELPFUL WEBSITES	55
APPENDIX B: GLOSSARY.....	56
APPENDIX C: SURVEY FORM.....	58
I. GENERAL OVERVIEW OF YOUR STATE’S E-GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES OR PROJECTS.....	58
II. INFORMATION ABOUT AN E-GOVERNMENT PROJECT	58
III. QUESTIONS FOR FOLLOW -UP TELEPHONE CONVERSATION.....	62
APPENDIX D: RESOURCES	63
A. SAMPLE PRIVACY POLICIES	63
B. SAMPLE END-USER FEEDBACK MECHANISMS.....	63
C. SAMPLE STYLE SHEETS AND WEB GUIDELINES.....	63
D. SURVEYS, REPORTS AND RELATED RESEARCH	63

APPENDIX E: SUMMARY TABLES	65
I. GENERAL OVERVIEW.....	65
II. INFORMATION ABOUT E-GOVERNMENT PROJECTS.....	66
APPENDIX F: STATE CONTACTS FOR PORTAL SURVEY PROJECT.....	70

Executive Summary

The Texas State Legislature instructed the Department of Information Resources (DIR) to establish a task force to assess the feasibility of creating an Internet-based system through which state and local governments can interact with the public. An Electronic Government Task Force has since been formed and among its first tasks was implementation of a survey of other states' approaches to electronic government. DIR staff emailed a short-answer survey to 20 states. Formal responses were received from 16 states and then follow-up calls were made to respondents. This report summarizes the findings from that survey and offers several recommendations to the Task Force as it studies the feasibility of electronic government (e-government) in Texas.

The survey process explored the following questions:

- What should be the ultimate purpose of e-government, and how are other states approaching this challenge?
- Who are the ultimate beneficiaries of e-government and how should their needs be prioritized?
- How much does it cost to put government on-line?
- What kinds of challenges are ahead, i.e., what, if any, are the downsides to online government?
- How does e-government really work and what kinds of resources does it take to launch and maintain an effective e-government initiative?
- How long will it take to get e-government up and running in the state of Texas?

Major findings of this survey:

- There is no unified vision for online or e-government across states, partly because e-government is so new, and also because its benefits and costs are not yet clear. But there are some underlying benefits being identified: convenience, greater access to information, and the potential to reduce costs of individual transactions.
- States developing web portals as electronic gateways to government services and information that are self-funding (at no cost to taxpayers) tend to prioritize the needs of the business community first as potential users of "packaged" government information. In these cases, agencies with large data inventories of interest to the private sector are being targeted first for participation.
- Little information is available about the real costs at both the enterprise and agency levels of states' e-government initiatives. There is also little available evidence concerning cost savings due to state web portals.
- All states are grappling in different ways with several challenges that include balancing the needs of private and public sector interests, addressing information privacy and data security issues, coordinating collaboration among levels of government, and articulating the benefits to agencies for participation in the new online model of government.
- Considerable attention to coordinating activities among agencies and various levels of government is required in order for e-government to work smoothly from an enterprise perspective. States reflect a blend of oversight, governing and management structures. The most cohesive models, however, are being led by bodies with a strong mandate and the authority to carry it out.
- It is clear that e-government is a staged and ongoing process. States that contract their portal to the private sector have a shorter initial startup phase.

Summary recommendations to the task force based on this survey:

- There are many beneficiaries of e-government. They include the general public, government itself, and the business community. To address the interests of each of these groups and avoid privileging one at the expense of another, formalized mechanisms should be established to assess beneficiaries' information needs and concerns. Portal services should reflect those needs and include measures for ongoing evaluation of impact.

- Online government should not be positioned as a revenue-generating program for the state of Texas. Instead, online government is an extension of, and an improved delivery method for, basic government services to state residents.
- In a recent study, Texas was one of four states ranked lowest in terms of legislation passed on privacy protection.¹ Addressing the information security, data integrity and privacy concerns of beneficiaries should be a primary concern of the Task Force. Special subcommittees should be formed to study these issues and report findings and recommendations to the Task Force. Each subcommittee should be assigned a subject matter expert. Mechanisms designed to solicit public comment and participation should also be included as an essential element of study processes.
- The Task Force should develop criteria that define the costs and benefits required to put government on-line and to assess the impact of e-government on various constituent groups.
- A cohesive and coordinated effort will be needed to implement e-government in Texas. Statewide leadership of such an effort should be clearly established.

¹ Wilson, D.L. (1999, October 9). *California ranked near the top in privacy: celebrity culture, technical expertise bolster state's laws*. Washington, DC: Mercury Center.

Introduction

In July 1997, the White House communicated its vision for a U.S. role in the growing global electronic marketplace. Stating that electronic commerce should be facilitated primarily by the private sector, the Administration also framed its view of a special role for government. First, it stated that government should establish measures to avoid imposing any unnecessary restrictions on the conduct of electronic commerce. Second, government should facilitate a workable legal environment for e-commerce; and finally, government should recognize the uniqueness of the Internet as a global communications medium. Since 1997, significant innovation has occurred related to the development of Internet-facilitated commerce. And experts predict that as the public gains more experience with these emerging online tools and information resources, people will come to expect a similar level of service from government entities.

Evidence of these expectations can be seen around the world as governments implement centralized entry points to their services as vehicles to facilitate greater public participation. The Global Information Infrastructure Commission is one example of this trend.² Similarly, the National Information Infrastructure initiative³ has established an ambitious agenda here in the United States. Now numerous state, county, and municipal governments are actively using the Internet to bring an increasing number of services to the public in electronic form. In the state of Texas, the legislature has been instrumental in promoting this agenda.

Recognizing the importance of electronic commerce to the state and its potential to help increase the effectiveness of state government, the Texas state Legislature mandated the demonstration of electronic government through Senate Bill 974 (Section 2054.062). The 1999 legislation charges the Department of Information Resources with "establishing a task force to assess the current and future feasibility of establishing a common electronic system using the Internet through which state agencies and local governments can accomplish the following types of functions electronically:⁴

1. Send documents to members of the public and persons who are regulated by a state agency or local government;
2. Receive applications for licenses and permits and receive documents for filing from members of the public and persons who are regulated by a state agency or local government that, when a signature is necessary, can be electronically signed by the member of the public or regulated person; and
3. Receive required payments from members of the public and persons who are regulated by a state agency or local government."

Not later than November 1, 2000, DIR was also directed to report the findings of the Task Force and the results of the demonstration project to the presiding officer of each house of the legislature and to the chairs of the committees of each house of the legislature that have primary oversight jurisdiction over DIR.

The task force is composed of a representative of each of the following state officers or agencies:

- the Secretary of State;
- the Comptroller;
- the Texas Department of Economic Development;
- the General Services Commission;
- the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission;
- the Texas Department of Insurance;
- the Public Utility Commission of Texas; and
- representatives of local governments appointed by the governor in the number determined by the governor;
- three representatives of businesses that are regulated by a state agency or local government, appointed by the governor; and

² See <http://gii.org/focus/ecommerce/>

³ See <http://nii.nist.gov/nii/niiinfo.html>

⁴ TEX. GOV'T. CODE ANN. 2054.062 (Vernon 1999).

- three public members appointed by the governor.

To accomplish its mission, the Task Force elected to issue a statewide contract for development of a "common business portal" as a framework through which members of the public and persons who are regulated by a state agency or local government can do the following:

- send documents to members of the public and persons who are regulated by a state agency or local government;
- receive applications for licenses and permits;
- receive documents for filing; and
- receive required payments.

As guidance in the development of this contract, DIR conducted a limited survey of 20 other state portal initiatives. This is a report of the findings from that survey.

Methodology

DIR staff first conducted preliminary background research on other portal projects around the country. Staff obtained questionnaires about e-government activities being used by organizations such as the National Electronic Commerce Coordinating Committee (NECCC) and the National Association for State Information Resources Executives (NASIRE). Staff also consulted with research with information consulting firms such as Meta, Giga, and the Gartner Group to identify national trends related to e-government and state web portals. With this information DIR then developed a survey and distributed it via email to e-commerce representatives in 20 states. States were selected based on their known experience with portal projects or because they share similar characteristics as Texas in terms of government structure, population size, and demographics.

Completed surveys were received from 16 out of 20 states. For states that did not return a survey form, researchers reviewed state web pages and also made telephone calls to key individuals for additional information. After reviewing the survey responses, all states were subsequently contacted and interviewed over the phone to glean additional qualitative information about various aspects of these portal projects. A copy of the survey and an overview of responses are contained in the Appendix section of this report. For more detailed information on each state, the reader should consult the States At-A-Glance section.

Organization of the Report

This report has been organized so that readers can glean trends across states and also gain some comparative information between and among various approaches to state portal development. The following section on *Findings and Recommendations* section summarizes trends observed across states and brings specific issues to the attention of the e-government task force as it moves ahead with development of the state's portal demonstration project. The next section (*States At A Glance*) summarizes activities in each of the states that was surveyed. Finally, several *Appendix* sections provide additional detail, for example, the survey form, a condensed summary of responses to the survey, resources used, and several useful information sources.

Findings and Recommendations

This section summarizes findings from DIR's survey of 20 states. The research reported is the result of interviews and interpretation of survey responses. Findings, analysis and associated recommendations have been summarized into the following topic areas:

- Scope of State Portal Projects and Initiatives
- Approaches to Oversight, Governing and Management of Portal Projects
- Statutory Frameworks
- Public/Private Partnerships
- Methods of Assessing Costs/Benefits
- Portal Services
- Methods of Handling Data Security, Data Integrity, and Information Privacy Concerns
- End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues

Scope of State Portal Projects and Initiatives

Issue and Research Approach: Texas seeks to adopt an enterprise approach to development of its state web portal. Therefore the survey sought information about the pros and cons associated with such an approach. Several questions asked about the general status of electronic government in each state. Follow-up telephone interviews also helped researchers discern information about the scope of projects in other states.

Findings:

- There was considerable variation in states' approaches to and perceptions about portal projects. Projects seemed to group into two categories: an enterprise approach and a more limited type of initiative.
- Most states are approaching their state web portal from an enterprise perspective. They report having or planning a website that will serve as a comprehensive gateway to all state agencies, boards, commissions, and in some cases, county and local government. These enterprise approaches are being handled in one of two ways:
 - 1) state-managed and operated (e.g., Massachusetts, Florida, and Washington), or
 - 2) managed and operated by a private contractor (e.g., Indiana and Kansas, among others).
- An enterprise approach may not reveal the same outcome from state to state. While there seems to be much enthusiasm about the potential of the Internet to transform government processes and make government more accessible to the public, there is also a certain degree of confusion about what various terms and concepts mean. Phrases such as "enterprise approach to government," and terms such as "gateway," and "portal" carry different meanings in different contexts.
- Agency participation in most states interviewed is optional (Pennsylvania indicated that participation at some level will be required). While participation is not mandated in most cases, active participation by state agencies in e-government projects is considered essential and therefore actively encouraged. Interviews revealed that agencies are more likely to participate if they are able to maintain institutional autonomy in decision-making about information provided through the portal. Also, each instance of agency participation seems to be a carefully negotiated process.
- Because e-government projects are usually broad in focus and require the collaboration of multiple agencies and administrative groups, there is no "one stop shopping" for information about these initiatives, even in states with an explicit enterprise approach. It is difficult to find one person or office in each state that has a comprehensive understanding of all aspects of the state's e-government initiative.

Recommendations:

- To avoid confusion about the scope of e-government project in Texas state government, it might be helpful to adopt a set of definitions to guide online initiatives. For example, the term "state portal" might be used to refer to a common, comprehensive electronic gateway (or entry point) to state, county, and local government information and services.⁵

⁵ See also this definition of "portal" from America Online: <http://members.aol.com/Im4Justice/Portals.html> and the Glossary included in the Appendix of this report.

- To establish a constructive setting in which to engage state agency participation, the portal initiative should reflect the visions for information resources management that are articulated in the most recent State Strategic Plan for Information Resources Management.
- The portal project should coordinate its actions with other e-government initiatives in Texas state government.

Approaches to Oversight, Governing and Management of Portal Projects

Issue and Research Approach: Certain types of governance processes and administrative structures facilitate an enterprise approach to the delivery of online services and information. Many legacy structures and institutional practices present barriers that delay or block information sharing across agency jurisdictions and these must be addressed by executive levels in state government. Additionally, e-government requires addressing not only technical challenges, but also attention to numerous public policy issues. With these ideas in mind, the survey sought to identify how different states are approaching planning, oversight, and day-to-day management of state web portals.

Findings:

- Though methods of governing and managing state portal projects differed widely among the states interviewed, no state surveyed has completed a portal project without some type of governing board or body. For example, in New York State, a special high level forum has been created to coordinate a statewide approach to e-government. Washington has a cabinet-level subcommittee that is chaired by the governor's chief of staff and the state's technology advisor, and Utah has launched a Digital State Initiative.
- States working toward an enterprise approach have involved the executive branch and/or state leadership. These participants typically include some combination of the following entities: the state's CIO office, the governor's office, the state legislature, and/or the state's lead technology agency.
- In every state, there is a designated portal management group with technical expertise that reports to the governing body. Several states (e.g., Indiana, Arkansas, Maine) have passed legislation to facilitate outsourcing portal operations to a private-sector management group.
- Participating agencies are given autonomy in determining what information will be provided through the portal. A portal management group gains acceptance from agencies by providing assistance and services. In some cases (e.g., Arizona) state CIOs have taken the lead to interest agencies in taking an enterprise approach to the state portal. In other states (e.g., California, Utah's Digital State Initiative) the governor's office has launched an initiative or issued an edict that strongly encourages statewide agency participation.

Recommendations:

- In a decentralized state like Texas, a formalized and coordinated body of several key agencies is the optimal method for designing, implementing, and maintaining a state government portal, regardless of whether or not a private partner is involved.
- The coordinating body needs to be given authority to carry out the portal initiative.
- There needs to be a formalized group made up of technology professionals that can oversee/manage day-to-day operation of the portal.
- Agency participation is an essential component of portal development. Processes and mechanisms should be developed to garner support and participation from state agencies.

Statutory Frameworks

Issue and Research Approach: The survey collected information about how states are approaching legislation, rules, standards and guidelines associated with digital signatures, information privacy, web design and subcontracting agreements for portal development and operation.

Findings:

- Successful e-government initiatives require policies that enable and encourage collaboration and cooperation among diverse government entities. Policy development (e.g., uniform commercial codes, intellectual property protection, privacy, security, content, technical standards) at the enterprise level facilitates cohesive and strategic approaches to implementing online government initiatives that facilitate doing business with the state, protecting individuals' information privacy, and establishing standard data security measures throughout government.

- As mentioned earlier, several states (e.g., Indiana, Arkansas, Maine) have passed legislation to facilitate the outsourcing of portal operations to a private-sector management group.
- It was surprising to learn that none of the states interviewed reported experiencing any formalized public concern over information privacy issues related to their portal projects. Enterprise-level privacy policies, however, are being developed. California is an example of a state that already has legislation that addresses information privacy concerns at the enterprise level.

Recommendations:

- An enterprise approach to portal development should include the elaboration of statewide policies that address data security, information privacy, and end user access issues.
- Policies should be developed that delineate the scope and accountability of the portal operator in support of statewide policies.
- An investigation should be made about the need for specific legislation enabling the contracting of portal operations.

Public/Private Partnerships

Issue and Research Approach: The State Strategic Plan for Information Resources Management states that making the best use of specialized expertise available in both the public and private sectors allows state agencies to focus on their core missions and goals. Establishing strong, trusted partnerships between the two sectors will help the state manage technology in the most efficient and cost-effective manner possible. Questions about portal management were designed to learn more about how portals are being managed in other states, and how relationships with private contractors are being structured.

Findings:

- Most of the states in this survey that are contracting out portal operations have specific legislation that establishes an agreement with the private partner. In some cases, outsourcing is handled on a more limited basis. For example, Washington outsourced the initial development of the portal, but retained responsibility for day-to-day operational management.
- Several states (Massachusetts, Florida, and Washington) have developed portals without subcontracting portal operations to a private sector vendor.
- Contracting with a vendor does not necessarily ensure a comprehensive or enterprise approach to a state portal. For example, in Virginia and Arkansas, the portal does not serve as a central gateway (i.e., a single face of government) to all government entities; instead, the portal serves only those agencies that have elected to participate in the vendor-state contract. Virginia reported that its state web page will soon be integrated into the portal website.
- States that have contracted with private vendors bring business-oriented data with strong value-added potential online first, such as drivers' license information, in order to ensure that both the vendor and the state benefit from the contract.

Recommendations:

- State portals can be effective whether operated by an external party or by the state. Based on the task force's time frame, short-term objectives, and needs of Texas citizens, a decision on how to approach full implementation of the state portal will need to be made.
- Outsourcing portal operation does not outsource the state's responsibility. If contracting with vendors, the state should frame performance expectations, staffing approvals, and desired reports, and incorporate these in any contracts for the operation of state portal services.
- The state web page should be appropriately integrated with business aspects of the portal.
- If contracting with vendors, the state retains the responsibility of planning which applications are brought online. Appropriate care should be taken to ensure that a proper balance of applications is developed that benefits the general public as well as the business community.

Methods of Assessing Costs/Benefits

Issue and Research Approach: As government becomes more available via the Internet, there is a need to assess the "real" benefits and the possible risks that accompany transition to electronic means of gathering and distributing

information. Researchers queried states for concrete proposals, plans, guidelines, and/or reports documenting the costs and benefits of their portal projects.

Findings:

- No formal examples of studies and/or reports detailing the costs and/or benefits of state portal projects were available from the states interviewed for this study. Most states were only able to provide anecdotal claims about how putting agency information on the Internet has saved time, money, paper, or personnel resources:
 - Benefits to the business community: increased ease of doing business with and in the state, reduced employee time spent on applying for permits, filing taxes, etc.
 - Benefits to the general public: greater access to government information, and greater ease of use in downloading forms or transacting business with government, such as license renewal
 - Benefits to state agencies: better service to the public and reduced staff time spent processing paperwork
 - Benefits to state government: the creation of a single face of government and widespread access to government information
- Few states could provide explicit guidance on the performance measures necessary to ensure portal acceptance, usability, and growth. Indiana was able to provide an example of quarterly reporting requirements to its portal oversight authority, but the reporting reflects only portal activities such as number of agencies online, projects completed, etc. It does not provide a model for assessing impact. Washington provided a copy of a cost-benefit analysis that must be completed before agencies can accept credit cards online, but again, the assessment tool is limited to one specific area.
- Several contacts in follow-up telephone conversations stressed the fact that the portal should not be thought of solely as a revenue-producing mechanism. States are not seeing additional revenues generated by the portals. They suggest that the objectives of the portal should be to benefit the general public and businesses seeking to do business with and in the state.
- While several states contracted under a model of no initial start-up cost to the state, with the vendor relying upon revenue streams from value-added data reporting to operate the portal, this does not mean that there was no cost to the state involved in the contract. A governing board and staff for contract and project management are necessary. Also, several states had applications that simply built an interface with the portal - the maintenance and operation of the back-end databases remained the responsibility of the state, with associated operational costs.

Recommendations:

- It will be necessary to develop specific costs and benefits, and ways of measuring these, as a portal project will be difficult to support if it lacks measurable goals and reliable information about the real costs and benefits of the project.
- Establishing performance measures will help the state develop and improve the portal. Appropriate measures should be developed that can be used to track outcomes, quality, and operational performance for the portal.
- Clarity about the goals and expected activities of the portal will be critical in order for state leadership and the public to understand how the portal is operated. Explanations of the expenses and potential revenues generated through the portal should be available on a regular basis and updated as new applications are brought online.
- As part of the portal operational planning, costs borne by the state in the effort, including staff on a governing board or contract management staff, should be reported to ensure a true picture of the total cost of the portal.

Portal Services

Issue and Research Approach: In a decentralized state like Texas with more than 200 state government agencies, it is a challenge to determine which agencies and information services should be included in a portal demonstration project. This fact guided several questions about the types of services offered through states' web portals. During interviews with respondents, researchers also inquired about how states determine which services to offer in which sequence and for whom and what incentives are being used to encourage agency participation.

Findings:

- There is no generic model for portal design. Navigational designs differ among states.
- There is no information about usability of state web portals, i.e., no states could provide information about end-user testing of portal services.

- States varied as to the extent of interaction offered through the portal probably because most of these initiatives are so new.
- There was wide variation in the numbers and types of services available through state portal sites. Transactional services offered via portals provide different levels of interaction. A limited transactional service allows an end-user to download a form; however, that person still needs to complete the form off-line and then mail it back to the agency using traditional postal procedures. A full transactional service allows the user both to complete the form and submit it to the agency while on-line.
- In most states, the informational aspect of the portal is integrated with the business aspect. Contracted portals often provide a special link to "premium services" which are subscription-based services that result from the aggregation (usually by the portal's private partner) of several state agency databases. The most common subscription service is transportation related.

Recommendations:

- There should be seamless integration between the state web page and the services provided to the business community (e.g., through a common business portal). Portal site design should make it easy for end-users to know how to use interactive features of the web portal.
- Prototype navigational designs for the portal should be tested with different end-user groups.

Methods of Handling Data Security, Data Integrity, and Information Privacy Concerns

Issue and Research Approach: Online government is becoming increasingly vulnerable to information security threats. As more information is shared and made accessible via the Internet, there is growing concern about data integrity and personal information privacy protection. Additionally, balancing privacy laws with open records laws represents a public policy challenge for all state agencies. The survey sought information about various approaches to these issues.

Findings:

- While numerous efforts are underway at federal and state levels to address information privacy concerns, few state web portals have explicit guidelines in place to address privacy issues.
- Policies related to security, data integrity, web standards and other enterprise-level issues are not always published in one location on state web portals. For this reason, it is difficult to discern state policies, rules, guidelines, and standards related to portal development and operation.
- Several states have already implemented digital signatures while others are still in the planning stages. California, Utah, New York, and Virginia have passed legislation related to the use of digital signatures.

Recommendations:

- Critical attention should be directed to an examination of information privacy issues, especially as the potential for data aggregation increases as more agencies participate in the portal.
- All rules, guidelines, and standards related to state portal operations should be available through the portal.
- Portal operations using digital signatures should adhere to Texas digital signature rules.

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues

There are many beneficiaries of e-government. They include the general public, the government, and the business community. The survey included questions to learn how different states are assessing these different end users' information needs and concerns. Findings have been grouped into four areas: 1) individuals with disabilities; 2) language/literacy barriers; 3) access to Internet resources; and 4) policies on charging for public information.

1. Individuals with Disabilities: State and local governments must comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) guidelines on Internet web pages.⁶ Although not included in the survey itself, DIR researchers asked several respondents during telephone interviews about their approaches to ADA concerns.

⁶ Per Civil Rights Division, U.S. Office of the Assistant Attorney General: "...entities subject to title II or III of the ADA must provide effective communication to individuals with disabilities, and covered entities that use the Internet to provide information regarding their programs, goods or services must be prepared to offer those communications through accessible means. Such entities may provide web page information in text format that is accessible to screen reading devices that are used by people with

Findings:

- Several states have issued some type of disclaimer about disability access to online government services.

Recommendations:

- A mechanism/process should be established to assess and address end-user accessibility issues.

2. Language/literacy barriers: Experience in the use of computers to access electronic information varies widely among members of the public. For these reasons, researchers also scanned state portal pages for examples of policies related to assistance to end users on access to state government information.

Findings:

- Few states have policies related to language and/or literacy barriers.

Recommendations:

- Some effort should be made to examine end-users' capacity to benefit from online government services.

3. Access to Internet resources: Federal documentation of an increasing "digital divide" in the U.S.⁷ highlights the fact that numerous people do not yet have access to or know how to use computers or the Internet. Increasing the presence of on-line government may benefit many who already have access to these resources while others may be disadvantaged by this, especially if agencies do not continue to support non-electronic information access services.

Findings:

- Only one state (Indiana) has linked its portal initiative to any outreach or grant program designed to ensure that state residents have ways to access e-government services.

Recommendations:

- A process should be developed that explores end-user access needs. Participants might include the Telecommunications Infrastructure Fund Board, the Texas State Library, the Texas Education Agency, and the Texas Commission for the Blind.

4. Policies on Charging for Public Information: There is some level of public debate about whether governments should charge for public information, and if so, how much. Thus, researchers gathered information about different pricing models across states.

Findings:

- Several fee-generating models were observed and they are being combined in different ways in different states: 1) a "self-funding", or cost-recovery, model that involves a state contract with a private vendor; 2) a revenue-sharing model with a private contractor; 3) transaction fees for services; and 4) subscription-based services.
- Massachusetts reported experiencing considerable public opposition to charges for public information. The survey respondent suggested that it would be a mistake to position the portal solely as a revenue-generating (cost-recovery) mechanism for state government. Indiana also advised against promoting the portal solely as a revenue-generating mechanism.

Recommendations:

- A process should be created to facilitate ongoing study the impact of various policies related to fees for information and services via the state portal.

visual impairments, and they may also offer alternative accessible formats that are identified in a screen-readable format on a web page" (<http://www.johnco.cc.ks.us/acad/etc/technotes/ada.htm>).

⁷ See <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/fttn99/contents.html> for most recent federal report entitled "Falling Through the Net: Defining the Digital Divide."

Surveyed States At-A-Glance

This section contains a synopsis of each state's portal initiative. States contracting portal management to a private partner are indicated with an asterisk (*). In instances where information was not available, the abbreviation INA is used. For information that it not applicable, NA is used.

To highlight some of the applications online, DIR conducted a review of the state's web sites to determine if the following high-interest services were available. The search was regardless of whether or not the state took a portal approach to their Internet presence, and regardless of whether or not the state had contracted with a vendor. The search was specifically for online interactions. Many states had relevant information along with forms available for downloading, but citizens could not complete a transaction online.

[Note: the following data current as of December 1999]

	Drivers' License (Service or Search)	Automobile Tag/Registration Renewal	Hunting and Fishing License Purchases	Tax Filings	Business License (Renewal or Search)
Arizona*	No	Yes	No	No	No
Arkansas*	Yes (search only)	Yes	No	Yes	Yes (search only)
California	No	No	No	Yes **	No
Florida	No	No	No	No	Yes (search only)
Georgia*	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Idaho*	No	No	Yes	Yes**	No
Indiana*	Yes (search only)	Yes	No	Yes**	No
Iowa*	No	No	No	Yes**	No
Kansas*	Yes (search only)	No	Yes	Yes	No
Maine*	Yes (search only)	No (pilot planned)	Yes	Yes	No
Massachusetts	No	Yes	No	No	Yes (search only)
Michigan	Yes	Yes	Not on state portal. Online with vendors.	Yes	Yes, renewal through electronic fax
Missouri	No	No	No	No	No
Nebraska*	No	No (search plates)	Yes	No	No
New York	No	Yes	No	Yes**	No
Ohio	No	No	No	No	No
Pennsylvania	No	No	No	Yes**	No
Utah*	No	No	No	No	No
Virginia*	No	Yes	No	Yes (one county)	No
Washington	No	No	No	Yes	No

* indicates states that have contracted for development and/or support of an enterprise portal

** indicates proprietary or special software is required for Internet filing

Arizona*

Scope: Planning an enterprise approach. State plans to issue contract to private partner for self-funding model of portal development and management. Current pilot conducted with IBM for vehicle registration renewals online.

Portal Name: Arizona @ Your Service

Internet Address: To be determined

Launch Date: 2000

Portal Catalyst(s): CIO's office

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: Webmaster practices guidelines
(http://gita.state.az.us/PSP/GUIDELINES/p501-g001_web_master_guideline.htm)

Portal Oversight:

- **At present:** Government Information and Technology Agency (GITA)
- **Planned:** Portal Management Committee - make-up to be determined (Also to be facilitated by a subset of the CIO Council, a committee involving CIOs from the 12 largest agencies)

Portal Management: Contracted entity (private partner)

Agency Participation: Participation is not mandatory but is strongly encouraged. Initial participating agencies already targeted include the Department of Motor Vehicles, corporate licensing agencies, and the Secretary of State's Office.

Services:

Business-related: Planned

General Public: Planned

Using Credit Cards: Planned

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment:

Evaluation process in place: The state tracks activity in several ways now (e.g., number of licenses issued, amount of fees paid, site visit counts, and number of requests for forms). The RFP requires a formal evaluation process to assess public use of portal services.

Impact on participating agencies: Arizona anticipates a reduction in agency costs and an increase in revenues. It also expects some impact on internal agency processes.

Impact on business community: The navigation design should streamline business access to needed services; value-added services anticipated (proceeds to be redirected to develop more online applications).

Public impact: The state anticipates a possible increase in some existing fees for services

Impact to the state overall: The self-funding portal will save costs to state; however, some administrative overhead will always be present for portal contract administration. Arizona anticipates some cost- and revenue-sharing arrangements with the private partner.

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: Yes

Directory services used: X.500, LDAP, and XML

Digital signatures used for top level authentication: Yes (pilot stages)

Server growth projected: Yes, particularly in application and database servers.

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: No policy available at present but planned.

Individuals with disabilities: INA

Language/literacy barriers: INA

Access to Internet resources: This is already provided through the Arizona Department of Administration.

Policies on charging for public information: Charges will follow a self-funding model. There will be a charge for some value-added services, and the same or reduced fees for existing services, depending on operating costs.

Customer feedback/needs assessment: INA

Marketing: Yes

Lessons Learned: NA

Arkansas*

Scope: Operational enterprise portal, offering full service transactional services. Arkansas did not conduct a pilot project first.

Portal Name: Information Network of Arkansas (INA)

Internet Address: <http://www.state.ar.us>

Launch Date: 1997

Portal Catalyst(s): Legislature

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: Enabling legislation for Information Network of Arkansas (http://www.state.ar.us/ina/INA_code.html)

Portal Oversight: Governing Board of Information Network of Arkansas

Portal Management: Information Network of Arkansas

Agency Participation: Participation is not required.

Services:

Business-related: Premium subscription services include access to Arkansas drivers records; legislative information (Lobbyist-in-a-Box); access to nursing registry, search capability of workers' compensation claims and opinions. Free services to anyone on the network include search capability of banks and insurance, co-operatives, homebuilders, home inspectors, incorporations, notaries public, and trademarks; corporate online filing system. Additionally, no subscription is required for premium tax payments and filings as well as online appointments for insurance companies.

General Public: Full-transactional service includes renewal of car tags; informational content includes searchable online directory of state agencies and employees, interactive trip planner, employment information, filing taxes, revenue and budget information, child support enforcement information

Using Credit Cards: Yes, for premium services and agency programs

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment:

Evaluation process in place: INA

Impact on participating agencies: Paper processes eliminated; Postal and paper production expenses reduced; personnel reassigned and headcount reduced

Impact on business community: Filing fees were reduced.

Public impact: INA

Impact to the state overall: The contractor receives 12.25% of each driver's record requested., and returns a percentage of its profits back to the state.

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: Yes, application links and porting information

Directory services used: No

Digital signatures used for top level authentication: legislation has been passed to provide the acceptance of digital signatures but no applications are in place as yet.

Server growth projected: Yes. As more applications are added, server upgrades and additions occur.

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: No policy available

Individuals with disabilities: INA

Language/literacy barriers: INA

Access to Internet resources: INA

Policies on charging for public information: INA

Customer feedback/needs assessment: During the design and development process a needs assessment occurs and customer feedback is solicited. With many new applications such as those for insurance, the insurance department actually involved a large insurer to provide feedback and pilot the system.

Marketing: Yes

Lessons Learned: INA

California

Scope: Planning an enterprise portal approach. There is a pilot extranet at the agency level.

Portal Name: Not yet determined by state

Internet Address: Not yet determined for statewide portal

Launch Date: 1999 for the business to business extranet

Portal Catalyst(s): Governor's Office for the statewide portal initiative and pilot project using Agency - the Department of Information Technology, DOIT, for digital signature and certificate laws.

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: Digital signature and digital certificates laws (California Government Code, Section 1-26)

Portal Oversight: Department of Information Technology (DOIT)

Portal Management: Department of Information Technology. The state assumes all costs.

Agency Participation: The pilot agency for statewide portal is the Department of Motor Vehicles.

Services:

Business-related: The existing extranet pilot has 5 participating banks exchanging approximately 500,000 account records.

General Public: The state currently offers electronic tax filing and searchable career opportunities.

Using Credit Cards: Yes

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment:

Evaluation process in place: Yes

Impact on participating agencies: INA

Impact on business community: Extranet pilot has required compliance for banks and financial institutions.

Public impact: The state has added the ability to track the number of records exchanged.

Impact to the state overall: INA

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: Banks and financial institutions link to a separate web-enabled database.

Directory services used: NA

Digital signatures used for top level authentication: Yes; regulations authorized by the Secretary of State identify requirements that Certification Authorities (CAs) must follow to be on an approved list of Californians who provide digital signatures for the State.

Server growth projected: INA

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: Privacy policy in place at DOIT (<http://www.doit.ca.gov/About/privacy.asp>; <http://www.doit.ca.gov/About/privacy.asp>). There is also an agency level privacy policy for the existing pilot extranet (<http://www.ftb.ca.gov/privacy/index.htm> and <http://www.ftb.ca.gov/privacy/index.htm>). California was recently praised by the Privacy Journal as a model state for laws protecting privacy (see <http://www.e-commerce.ca.gov/report.pdf>).

Individuals with disabilities: The Franchise Tax Board has a special link for persons with disabilities, offering large print forms and audiocassettes (<http://www.ftb.ca.gov/geninfo/disability.htm>).

Language/literacy barriers: Information for Spanish speakers is available via a link (<http://www.ftb.ca.gov/geninfo/disability.htm>).

Access to Internet resources: INA

Policies on charging for public information: INA

Customer feedback/needs assessment: Users can e-mail their comments to Franchise Tax Board's Executive Director.

Marketing: INA

Lessons Learned: California has developed a State Electronic Business Task Force Charter (formed October 1999) that is being used to frame and strategize a high-level statewide electronic business initiative. The Charter establishes an official project structure with an executive steering committee, an executive technical committee, and a project manager. It replaces what was previously an e-government task force; the Charter recreates this as an executive steering committee.

Florida

Scope: Limited portal that contains enterprise-wide links, but not part of a statewide initiative as yet

Portal Name: Florida Government Services DIRECT

Internet Address: <http://fcn.state.fl.us/gsd/>

Launch Date: 1997

Portal Catalyst(s): Agency - the Department of Management Services (DMS)

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: INA

Portal Oversight: Office of the Governor and the State Technology Office

Portal Management: Florida Department of Management Services (DMS). The state assumes all costs

Agency Participation: Participation is not mandatory. Agencies are encouraged but not required to participate by contacting with DMS which provides support to individual agencies.

Services:

Business-related: Allows searching for leasing space and centralized purchasing.

General Public: Offers searching for job vacancies and training opportunities. Provides 411 service, a professional license search, and links to state agencies, committees, commissions, and other organizations.

Using Credit Cards: Yes, for Purchasing Direct services (<http://purchasing.state.fl.us/>)

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment:

Evaluation process in place: Yes, the state tracks the number of licenses issued, the amount of fees paid, site visit counts, and the number of requests received for forms.

Impact on participating agencies: Agency procurement processes changed, as individual agencies can input their order directly to a vendor.

Impact on business community: INA

Public impact: Projections are that transactional costs will decrease.

Impact to the state overall: The state realizes 13% for cost recovery from value-added services and states that the purchasing card program will lead to an estimated \$300 million annual cost savings (see http://fcn.state.fl.us/fcn/centers/purchase/purchasing_card/index.html).

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: Application links are supported.

Directory services used: LDAP

Digital signatures used for top level authentication: Yes

Server growth projected: Yes

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: A privacy policy is available online
(<http://www.state.fl.us/copyright/copyright.html>)

Individuals with disabilities: INA

Language/literacy barriers: INA

Access to Internet resources: There is a kiosks program for Department of Labor

Policies on charging for public information: INA

Customer feedback/needs assessment: Comments form is available online
(http://www.state.fl.us/fgsd_html/email.html)

Marketing: Plan was developed

Lessons Learned: Website won "Best of the Web" award two years in a row.

Georgia*

Scope: Operational enterprise portal.

Portal Name: NA

Internet Address: <http://www.state.ga.us> and www.ganet.org

Launch Date: 1990

Portal Catalyst(s): Legislature

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: Oversight body established in the Georgia Code 50-25-1 (<http://www.ganet.org/cgi-bin/pub/ocode/ocgsearch?docname=OCode/G/50/25/1>)

Portal Oversight: GeorgiaNet Authority

Portal Management: Portal is managed by the GeorgiaNet Authority. The Authority contracts with the National Information Consortium to provide software and technical/development staff.

Agency Participation: The GeorgiaNet Authority works extensively with state agencies.

Services:

Business-related: (note the E-Commerce button on the state's homepage) Fees for services vary by each service – no subscription required except for the fee associated with Lobbyist in a Box. Users can register for conferences, order corporation documents, search corporation data, submit corporation filing fees, order GIS data sets, monitor legislative information, renew occupational licenses, business tax forms.

General Public: The site offers tuition payments by college students; ad valorem tax computation, links to hunting and fishing licenses and boat registration, order program document for long-term care, child care licensing, and health care, income tax forms.

Using Credit Cards: Yes, for virtually all fee services. Also offer GeorgiaNet account, a consolidated billing for frequent users.

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment:

Evaluation process in place: Typically this type of analysis is done internally by the individual state agency.

Impact on participating agencies: INA

Impact on business community: INA

Public impact: INA

Impact to the state overall: Georgia was recently ranked #1 among all states for use of electronic commerce by the Center for Digital Government.

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: Yes, where necessary.

Directory services used: Yes.

Digital signatures used for top level authentication: Yes, where necessary.

Server growth projected: Yes

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: INA

Individuals with disabilities: INA

Language/literacy barriers: INA

Access to Internet resources: INA

Policies on charging for public information: INA

Customer feedback/needs assessment: INA

Marketing: 3 member marketing staff.

Lessons Learned: INA

Idaho*

Scope: Planning an enterprise portal approach, The state is currently finalizing strategic planning, and a contract was awarded in October, 1999.

Portal Name: Access Idaho

Internet Address: INA

Launch Date: 1999

Portal Catalyst(s): Legislature

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: The Information Technology Resource Management Council was created by Idaho statutes 67-5745B; 67-5745C (<http://www3.state.id.us/cgi-bin/newidst?sctid=670570045B.K>; <http://www3.state.id.us/cgi-bin/newidst?sctid=670570045C.K>)

Portal Oversight: Information Technology Resource Management Council (ITRMC)

Portal Management: Information Technology Resource Management Council (ITRMC)

Agency Participation: Participation is not required.

Services:

Business-related: Services planned include licensing, filing, applications, record searches, purchasing and payments.

General Public: Services planned include payment of fees and traffic tickets.

Using Credit Cards: INA

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment:

Evaluation process in place: INA

Impact on participating agencies: INA

Impact on business community: INA

Public impact: INA

Impact to the state overall: INA

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: INA

Directory services used: INA

Digital signatures used for top level authentication: INA

Server growth projected: INA

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: No

Individuals with disabilities: INA

Language/literacy barriers: INA

Access to Internet resources: INA

Policies on charging for public information: INA

Customer feedback/needs assessment: No

Marketing: Yes

Lessons Learned: INA

Indiana*

Scope: Operational enterprise portal

Portal Name: Access Indiana Information Network

Internet Address: <http://www.state.in.us>

Launch Date: 12/95

Portal Catalyst(s): INA

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: The Intelenet Commission was created by Article 21 of the Indiana Code (<http://www.state.in.us/legislative/ic/code/title5/ar21/ch1.html>)

Portal Oversight: Intelenet Commission

Portal Management: Access Indiana Information Network (AIIN)

Agency Participation: State agencies under the Executive Branch are required to utilize the Access Indiana gateway as the host all Internet information and services.

Services:

Business-related: Premium Services (which require a subscription to the portal) include business entity name search; check corporate name availability; search driver's license records; automobile title and lien records; automobile registration records; Health Professions Bureau licenses search; certified nurse's aide registry; water well database search; floodway, waterway, lake or ditch construction permit filing; new hires reporting with workforce development; legislative bill-tracking service; Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission orders search. **Free business-related services** include: Sex Offender Registry search; judicial opinion search; Indiana Code search; listing of open bids with the state; legislation information search.

General Public: Services requiring a fee include: Indiana income tax filing and vehicle registration renewals. **Free general public services** include: winning lottery number search; instant election results; calendar of events and news releases; unclaimed property database search; Indiana job bank search; State Fair judging results, World War II veterans database search; licensed child care provider search.

Using Credit Cards: Yes

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment:

Evaluation process in place: Before December 31 of each year, the Intelenet Commission issues a written report to the general assembly and the governor that summarizes the financial and operational performance of the commission during the preceding fiscal year and forecasts the commission's future financial and operational performance. AIIN also produces bi-monthly General Manager's Reports showing financials, monthly accesses by agency, access history, new completed projects, completed site redesigns, upcoming redesigns, status of development projects, review of future projects, summaries of end-user feedback, review of agencies not yet online.

Impact on participating agencies: Through an enterprise approach to an internet portal, agencies do not have to individually maintain their own infrastructure of machines and people to deliver services. The enterprise approach builds one infrastructure that is shared by all agencies. Additionally, the self-supporting funding model means that there has been no budget impact to make information available to the Indiana constituency. Frequently, there is a positive impact through the implementation of an online service. For instance, the Dept of Revenue estimates that online filing saves \$1.50 per return versus paper filing.

Impact on business community: Businesses are able to get immediate access to state information and services in a cost-effective and efficient manner through the portal. Driver's records may be reviewed as an insurance agent talks to a new client; permits are issued in half the traditional time; attorneys and banks can instantly download a Certificate of Existence for an Indiana company.

Public impact: With time- and frustration-saving services such as Indiana income tax filing and online vehicle registration renewals, in addition to access to over 100,000 web pages on the portal, citizens of the state are realizing the benefits that Access Indiana has brought to the state. The portal now has over five million accesses each month.

Impact to the state overall: Using a public/private business model, Access Indiana has been developed and maintained without the appropriation of tax dollars; the portal is supported by transaction fees associated with commercially valuable records and services. In turn, the private partner provides application/content development, hardware/networking services and marketing services to the state at no charge, and provides the citizens of the state free access to over 99% of the information and services available through the portal.

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: Yes

Directory services used: No

Digital signatures used for top-level authentication: Not yet

Server growth projected: INA

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: INA

Individuals with disabilities: INA

Language/literacy barriers: INA

Access to Internet resources: INA

Policies on charging for public information: Service requests for fees associated with public records are reviewed and approved by the Enhanced Data Access Review Committee, which meets bi-monthly. They are charged by law <http://www.state.in.us/legislative/ic/1999/title5/ar21/ch6.html> to establish a reasonable fee for enhanced access to public records and other electronic records, so that user fees from all electronic transactions are sufficient to develop, maintain, operate, and expand the computer gateway administered by the Intelenet commission.

Customer feedback/needs assessment: INA

Marketing: Yes

Lessons Learned:

- Portal should not be positioned as a revenue-generating mechanism. Citizens have a tendency to view this as a tax on information. Instead, fees are charged for enhanced access to services and data.
- Benefits include increased speed, convenience and accuracy.
- Oversight board is very important but it is not wise to include the Public Utility Commission as oversight but as one of several agencies – too political.
- Technology does not drive e-commerce – marketing does.

Iowa*

Scope: Operational enterprise portal with the following goal: to bring government information and services electronically to the public, business, and industry using the Internet.

Portal Name: IOWAccess Network

Internet Address: <http://www.state.ia.us>

Launch Date: INA

Portal Catalyst(s): INA

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: IOWAccess Advisory Council By-Laws
(<http://www.state.ia.us/main/network/bylaws.html>)

Portal Oversight: State of Iowa Information Technology Services and IOWAccess Network Advisory Council

Portal Management: Department of Information Technology Services

Agency Participation: Optional

Services: Iowa has organized all of the state's agencies and resources into fifteen major groups. To look for an agency or resource, users "click" on a major group which takes them to a list of Website links in that area. An interesting feature is that each resource list is further organized into Government and Non-Government pages. To alternate between Government and Non-Government resources, users click on a "Change View" button.

Business-related: INA

General Public: INA

Using Credit Cards: INA

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment:

Evaluation process in place: Yes, but DIR researchers have not obtained copy of evaluation plan.

Impact on participating agencies: INA; too early to know

Impact on business community: Increase in demand has been observed, but no other details were available.

Public impact: Increase in demand has been observed, but no other details were available.

Impact to the state overall: INA

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: Yes, application links are provided to state database and porting of information is also supported.

Directory services used: X.500

Digital signatures used for top level authentication: INA

Server growth projected: Yes, but no other details available at this time.

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: No information privacy policy available at this time. State has received some formal complaints from the public, but no other details were provided.

Individuals with disabilities: INA

Language/literacy barriers: INA

Access to Internet resources: INA

Policies on charging for public information: INA

Customer feedback/needs assessment: Web site mentions that citizen and business surveys have been conducted to determine what services are in the greatest demand; however, survey results have not been obtained by DIR researchers.

Marketing: INA

Lessons Learned: INA

Kansas*

Scope: Operational enterprise portal that offers full service transactional services as part of its premium services. Kansas did not conduct a pilot project first.

Portal Name: Information Network of Kansas

Internet Address: <http://www.state.ks.us>

Launch Date: 1992

Portal Catalyst(s): Legislature

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: Enabling legislation for the Information Network of Kansas (<http://www.ink.org/public/statutes/ksa.cgi>)

Portal Oversight: Governing board of Information Network of Kansas

Portal Management: Information Network of Kansas

Agency Participation: Participation is not required

Services:

Business-related: Premium subscription services include access to motor vehicle records, corporation searches, property valuation data, legal, financial, and medical resources; legislative information (Lobbyist-in-a-Box).

General Public: Informational content includes searchable online directory of state agencies and employees, hunting and fishing licenses and fees, sexual offender database, civil service job openings

Using Credit Cards: INA

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment:

Evaluation process in place: Yes

Impact on participating agencies: Effect on agencies' revenues was approximately \$5 million, and agencies are actively developing e-commerce teams.

Impact on business community: INA

Public impact: Fees generally go down as a result of e-commerce.

Impact to the state overall: Approximately 90% of the receipts flow back to the state agencies.

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: Yes, agencies support their applications and INK supports the e-commerce applications.

Directory services used: No. Have not implemented directory services for applications

Digital signatures used for top level authentication: No, legislation is being pursued

Server growth projected: Yes, growth is now about 15% per year

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: Have privacy statements on site and follow state law regarding open records and privacy. <http://www.state.ks.us/public/about-ink/privacy.html>

Individuals with disabilities: INA

Language/literacy barriers: INA

Access to Internet resources: INA

Policies on charging for public information: INA

Customer feedback/needs assessment: Network manager handles this with customers

Marketing: Yes

Lessons Learned: INA

Maine*

Scope: Operational enterprise initiative. Signed contract with New England Interactive in April, 1999. The first services, Interactive Driver Records and Interactive Title & Registration, both functions of the Secretary of State's Office, became available in September 1999.

Portal Name: InforME

Internet Address: <http://www.informe.org/>

Launch Date: July 1999 see http://janus.state.me.us/newsletter/aug99/informe_up_and_running.htm for description

Portal Catalyst(s): InforME Board, Secretary of State and Chief Information Officer

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: "InforME Public Information Access Act," 1 M.R.S.A. § 531, (<http://janus.state.me.us/legis/statutes/1/title1ch140sec0.html>)

Portal Oversight: InforME Board

Portal Management: InforME Board

Agency Participation: Participation is not required

Services:

Business-related: access to driver records and title and registration records presently available, will have ability to search corporate and UCC filing records, and other services.

General Public: will provide driver's license renewal, search capability of existing vanity license plates, and other services to include on-line purchase of hunting, fishing and other licenses and merchandise related to Maine's Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife.

Using Credit Cards: Yes, planned but not yet implemented as of 12/99.

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment:

Evaluation process in place: Yes, NEI is required to track and report use to data custodian agencies and InforME board.

Impact on participating agencies: Costs will diminish as contractor is providing services that were either not done at all or done by state employees. Service level agreements between agencies and NEI allow agencies to retain a portion of statutory fees in exchange for providing services.

Impact on business community: INA

Public impact: INA

Impact to the state overall: NEI assumed hosting responsibilities for a portion the State of Maine Web site 12/8/99. The remainder is scheduled for migration in the first quarter of 2000. See http://janus.state.me.us/newsletter/dec99/informe_assumes_responsibility_f.htm for more information. A site search engine and "how do I" service have been added. A new State home page design is underway, and should be ready for implementation following the testing of the migration to NEI servers. The first InforME Annual Report to the Maine Legislature should be available early in 2000.

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: Yes

Directory services used: X.500 (Janus.state.me.us/bis/phone/phone.htm)

Digital signatures used for top level authentication: No. Legislation is under development.

Server growth projected: Yes

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: No privacy policy available.

Individuals with disabilities: INA NEI is bound by its Master Contract to adhere to the ADA Accessibility Standards adopted by the Information Services Policy Board. See <http://janus.state.me.us/policybd/meswhw2.htm>

Language/literacy barriers: INA

Access to Internet resources: There is a schools and libraries program, and the Maine ATM Distance Learning project provides support and equipment.

Policies on charging for public information: The Information Services Policy Board has the responsibility to set policies regarding fees that agencies charge for information. See <http://janus.state.me.us/policybd/feepol.htm> for the text of the policy. Maine FOIA sets parameters for access to public information, and a description and citation may be found at <http://web.state.me.us/legis/opla/confid.htm>. In addition, a Maine Assistant Attorney General has written an opinion regarding the permissibility to charge for value added information <http://janus.state.me.us/policybd/vaa.htm>, which led to the submission of the legislation which authorized the InforME Board.

Customer feedback/needs assessment: Provides feedback form on Website (<http://www.informe.org/new/index.html>) for citizens to request services and make suggestions for improved delivery methods.

Marketing: No, but is in development.

Lessons Learned: Private/public partnership governed by a board put agencies on a level playing field, rather than have the agencies competing with one another for limited funds. Legislation or executive order should be in place before beginning a statewide portal project. If outsourcing the project, keep the software in escrow and use an irrevocable Letter of Credit instead of a bond with a contract provision stating that the letter of credit may be reduced by 50% after first 6 months if Board is happy with outsourcing vendor's performance. The master contract requires NEI to provide one free service for every approved fee service.

Massachusetts

Scope: Operational gateway to state government and local community sites. Currently in the exploratory phase of a portal project

Portal Name: Official Home Page of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Internet Address: <http://www.state.ma.us/>

Launch Date: 1994

Portal Catalyst(s): The Executive Office for Administration and Finance's Information Technology Division (ITD) provides Internet connectivity for state agencies. The state's home page was developed in 1994 as a way to provide state agency information over the Internet. Since then, a majority of state agencies have a presence on the web and many agencies have moved from providing static information to providing online transactions that streamline government processes. For a history of the development of the Commonwealth's home page please see <http://www.state.ma.us/webmass/history.htm>

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: Guidelines for the development of state web sites are provided at <http://www.state.ma.us/webmass/>. The Commonwealth's Information Technology Architecture and Enterprise Standards can be found at <http://www.state.ma.us/itd/standard/index.htm>

Portal Oversight: Executive Office for Administration and Finance's Information Technology Division

Portal Management: Individual agencies are responsible for their own site's content. Agencies forward web pages to the Information Technology Division's Internet Services Group for quality assurance and posting to the state's web site. The state's web server is hosted by an ISP under a contract managed by ITD's Internet Services Group.

Agency Participation: Current site links to all agencies that currently have web sites. Forty smaller agencies, boards and commissions do not have web sites at this time.

Services:

The state's home page provides a convenient way for businesses and the general public to "Get things done" with government entities. Links are provided at the top level to Search Databases, File/Apply/Pay, Request Information, and Download Forms.

The state provides several web applications that enable citizens to file/apply for a permit/license online. These applications can easily be accessed from the homepage link titled "File/Apply/Pay" (www.state.ma.us/app.htm).

These applications include the following:

- {PRIVATE}[Application and Agreement for Child Support Services](#) DOR Child Support Enforcement
- [Apply for a License/ File Complaint Against](#) Office of Consumer Affairs and Business Regulation
- [Consumer Complaints](#) Office of Consumer Affairs and Business Regulation
- [Electronic Permit Application Forms Library](#) Department of Environmental Protection
- [Express Lane: pay citations, registration renewals, Duplicate registrations, and special plates](#) Registry of Motor Vehicles
- [Insurance Consumer Complaints](#) Division of Insurance
- [Investor Complaint Form](#) Secretary of the Commonwealth Securities Division
- [Mass Job Bank: Employer Services](#) Division of Employment and Training
- [Mass Job Bank: Job Seeker Services](#) Division of Employment and Training
- [On-Line Certification for Dry Cleaners and Photoprocessors](#) DEP Environmental Results Program (ERP)
- [Online Order Form for Maps or Digital Data](#) Massachusetts Geographic Information System (MassGIS)
- [Utility Complaints](#) Department of Telecommunications and Energy

- [Camping Reservations](#) Department of Environmental Management

In addition, the following applications are being developed for implementation:

- [SPORT](#), an application that enables citizens to purchase hunting and fishing licenses online, Department of Fisheries, Wildlife, and Environmental Law Enforcement
- [Corporate Division of Electronic Filing](#), enables corporations to file annual reports and UCC documents electronically, Secretary of State
- [Lobbyist Database](#), a database of lobbyist information supporting inquiries from the general public and electronic filing for lobbyists, Secretary of State.

Using Credit Cards: Yes. The following online license/permit applications currently accept credit card payments:

- Express Lane (Registry of Motor Vehicles) - a web application that enables users to pay with a credit card for renewing registrations, obtaining a duplicate registration and driver's licenses, paying citations, and ordering special plates online.
- Camping Reservations (Department of Environmental Management) – a web application that accepts credit card payments to reserve camping sites throughout the state.

The following application is under development: SPORT (Department of Fisheries, Wildlife, and Environmental Law Enforcement) – a web application that will accept credit card payments for hunting and fishing licenses.

Note: Massachusetts does not in any way restrict the acceptance of credit/debit cards or other types of electronic payments for government goods and services.

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment:

Evaluation process in place: No formal evaluation process in place. Site usage statistics are monitored (<http://www.state.ma.us/webmass/stats.htm>) and webmaster's email provides feedback regarding usability and satisfaction.

Impact on participating agencies: Web hosting and site management is provided to agencies at no additional cost

Impact on business community: Government information, forms and some transactions are available online at any time

Public impact: Accessibility to government information and processes is improved. Online transactions available any time at no additional cost improve convenience

Impact to the state overall: Improved communication and interaction between government employees and officials, business partners and the general public

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: Yes; in some cases links to actual agency servers; otherwise information is ported via data extracts or replication.

Directory services used: No

Digital signatures used for top level authentication: No

Server growth projected: Yes

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: A special task force in governor's office is looking at privacy issues including legislative changes (see <http://www.state.ma.us/consumer/New/pr062399.htm>). ITD is also working on guidelines for state agency privacy statements on web sites.

Individuals with disabilities: The Commonwealth's Information Technology Architecture and Enterprise Standards address accessibility of web sites (<http://www.state.ma.us/itd/standard/ArchStan.htm#HTMLAuth>). Minimum Web accessibility standards are currently being drafted.

Language/literacy barriers: Specific agency sites may address this issue. There is no statewide approach.

Access to Internet resources: As part of the Commonwealth Procurement Access and Solicitation System (Comm-PASS), the Commonwealth has established community access points throughout the state where computers with Internet access are available to the public. Internet access for the public is also available at public libraries throughout the state as part of a Board of Library Commissioners initiative.

Policies on charging for public information: Bias is towards not charging fees for public information made available on-line.

Customer feedback/needs assessment: The Citizen Information Service of the Office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth offers information on state programs and referrals to appropriate state agencies via The Citizens' Guide to State Services. Local and toll-free phone numbers are offered (TTD enabled) as well as email addresses. Contacts for further information and to report problems with the web site are provided at <http://www.state.ma.us/contact.htm>

Marketing: No statewide marketing efforts at present. Agencies are encouraged to publish their site addresses on their letterhead and agency publications.

Lessons Learned: Distributed content management to enable individual agencies to exercise control over content is extremely important. It is also beneficial to provide different ways to access the same information. Given the variety of audiences and the breadth of issues a state web site has to address, it's important to keep in mind the different contexts from which the same information may be sought. Some of the issues or challenges the state still faces include:

1. How to scale up the Public Access infrastructure to support the growing number of web transaction applications agencies are developing
2. How to achieve a consistent look and feel to provide "one face" of government
3. As more government business is conducted online and outsourcing options are considered, issues such as data ownership, confidentiality and privacy, application ownership, and fees for access to public information and government services are important public policy issues that need discussion.

Michigan

Scope: A new enterprise wide portal is under development. The site will include links to the State of Michigan Government, Counties, Townships, Cities, Villages, public protection and criminal justice, related government associations, information and technology oriented and other organizations and businesses, vendors, cooperative educational services, school districts, libraries, University research sites and others.

Portal Name: A formal name has not been determined. Working portal names include State of Michigan Home Page, State of Michigan Portal, and "e - Michigan".

Internet Address: <http://www.state.mi.us/>

Launch Date: The existing site was established on June 30, 1995. The new site will be implemented during 2000.

Portal Catalyst(s): Executive Branch

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: Under development.

Portal Oversight: State CIO in the Department of Management and Budget.

Portal Management: Policy framework and design management is under the Office of Information Technology Solutions, Department of Management and Budget. Operational and technical management is under telecommunications and technology units within the Department of Management and Budget.

Agency Participation: Optional, and actively encouraged.

Services: The state web site currently includes all three branches of government, with agency based links to other Internet resources. The state is rapidly and systematically moving toward a web centric operation where all services and systems will become available via an internet, intranet and extranet. See the section on scope for examples.

Business-related: A number of Departments have on-line, fax and telephone transaction capabilities, particularly in the licensing, regulatory and permitting areas and in registrations. Selected on-line business and regulatory services include: downloadable and selected interactive forms and other transactional capabilities (e.g. licenses, permits); tax filing; arts grants; Adult Foster Home, Child Day Care, Child Welfare licensing; internet enabled Talent / Job Bank; general mail boxes; and e - mail contact with professional staff.

General Public: Selected services to the general public include: downloadable and selective interactive forms; general mail boxes; e - mail contact with staff; license plates and watercraft registration; tax filing; employment and job related services, e.g. job searches and unemployment compensation; Medicaid fraud and patient / vulnerable adult complaints; child immunization registry; digital democracy services including access to legislators, legislation, and bills; a wide range of education and library services; scholarship and grant information.

Using Credit Cards: Selected applications, including Secretary of State and Consumer and industry Services.

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment: INA

Evaluation process in place: Yes.

Impact on participating agencies: Under review. Anticipate redesigned processes, more effective and efficient services, reduced costs.

Impact on business community: Under review. Anticipate increased convenience, quicker turnaround, improved accuracy, and reduced costs.

Public impact: Under review. Anticipate greater convenience, quicker turnaround, reduced costs.

Impact to the state overall: Under review. A move toward a "one-stop-shop" "single face" service model. Anticipate support for priority service areas such as education, health care, economic development and improvement in quality of life for residents, visitors and those in e - contact

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: Yes

Directory services used: Yes

Digital signatures used for top level authentication: No.

Server growth projected: Yes. Under review.

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: Current policies under review.

Individuals with disabilities: Under review.

Language/literacy barriers: Under review.

Access to Internet resources: Policies are under review. State Internet services can be accessed through home, businesses and public locations such as libraries, and through vendors for selected licenses (e.g. hunting and fishing). Other options such as kiosks are under review. Also, a number of agencies have links to other internet services, particularly in education, library services, taxation and revenues, employment and career development, and economic development.

Policies on charging for public information: Under review.

Customer feedback/needs assessment: Under development.

Marketing: Yes

Lessons Learned:

- Customer-centric and life choice based model and design.
- Service and business plan, not technology driven model and design.
- Need for a "single face," look and feel of portal (enterprise vs. aggregated silos).
- Customer, partner and agency involvement in all phases; provision of incentives.
- Process change, redesign, reengineering must proceed in tandem with portal design.
- Need to understand options and develop clear, well grounded positions on issues such as:
 - privacy, security, scope, content, standards, access (e.g. disabilities, language) and other policy and design issues
 - policy and business case for choice of funding model, potential fees and value adding approaches
 - extent and nature of public/private partnerships, balance between service provision and potential management responsibilities, potential fee sharing.

Note: the above options do not necessarily represent State of Michigan positions.

Mississippi

Scope: Considering e-government at this time for enterprise wide initiative; completed a feasibility study

Portal Name: Mississippi Inter@ctive

Internet Address: <http://www.state.ms.us>

Launch Date: December 10, 1999

Portal Catalyst(s): Research conducted by the Strategic Services Division of the Mississippi Department of Information Technology Services

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: Not yet determined

Portal Oversight: Oversight provided by the Strategic Services Division of the Mississippi Department of Information Technology Services

Portal Management: Management provided by the Strategic Services Division of the Mississippi Department of Information Technology Services

Agency Participation: Participation is not required.

Services:

Business-related: Mississippi Inter@Active is the state Internet portal providing interactive government services online to help meet the needs of businesses and the people of Mississippi. Developed and managed by the Department of Information Technology Services, Mississippi Inter@Active leverages the state's advanced-technology infrastructure and provides easy-to-use information 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

General Public: Our goals and objectives include expanding the base of users who can access public information as well as increasing the amount and availability of public information and transactions with the State of Mississippi. The duties of the Mississippi Inter@Active are to develop and implement a portal system to provide electronic access to public information for Mississippi citizens, to explore ways of expanding the amount and kind of public information provided, increasing the utility and form of the public information provided, and to explore ways of improving citizen and business access to public information

Using Credit Cards: Credit cards are not used at this time

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment:

Evaluation process in place: INA

Impact on participating agencies: INA

Impact on business community: INA

Public impact: INA

Impact to the state overall: INA

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: INA

Directory services used: INA

Digital signatures used for top level authentication: INA

Server growth projected: INA

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: INA

Individuals with disabilities: INA

Language/literacy barriers: INA

Access to Internet resources: INA

Policies on charging for public information: INA

Customer feedback/needs assessment: INA

Marketing: Marketing provided by the Strategic Services Division of the Mississippi Department of Information Technology Services

Lessons Learned: Results from the feasibility study include several recommendations. One is to look very carefully at a pure outsource model since the vendor would have control over the portal for a minimum of five years. The pure state model requires the state to assume portal roles such as advertising, public relations, customer relations, billing, collection, and systems development to name a few. A partnership model requires a vendor to implement the portal, but the state assumes control at some point. Since this is a grassroots initiative, the suggestion is made for requesting legislation to cover funding the portal, identifying the state roles, establishing a governing board, authority to sell advertising on the portal, and authority to change fees that agencies charge for services.

Nebraska*

Scope: Operational enterprise portal offering full service transactions.

Portal Name: Nebraska @Online

Internet Address: <http://www.state.ne.us>

Launch Date: 1997

Portal Catalyst(s): Legislature

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: Statutes expand the duties of the Nebraska State Records Board to include oversight and management of electronic access to government information, including information provided over the Internet.

Portal Oversight: Nebraska State Records Board (NSRB)

Portal Management: Nebraska @Online (Network Manager) for subscription-based premium services

Agency Participation: Agencies have been very cooperative, while participation is not mandatory

Portal Services:

Business-related (as subscriptions for "Premium Services"): UCC Searches (SOS), EFT Searches (SOS), Corporation/Business Entity Searches (SOS), Sale/Tax Use Permits (Dept of Revenue). State also offers UCC Filing capability online as a premium service.

General Public (as subscriptions for "Premium Services"): Drivers License Records (DMV), Titles, Liens, & Registrations (DMV)

Using Credit Cards: Yes. Form of payment should be indicated on Subscription forms (for NOL)

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment:

Evaluation process in place: INA

Impact on participating agencies: The DMV saved an equivalent of 2 FTEs/\$75,000 in paper reduction. Overall, revenue-generating transactions have increased.

Impact on business community: Secretary of State offers UCC filings at \$5/filing online vs. \$6/filing via paper.

Public impact: Benefits include being able to submit online form filing, requesting permits, and the ability to update information from remote locations

Impact to the state overall: Nebraska@Online provides an Internet gateway to resources made available by dozens of other state agencies, state funded colleges/universities, and other Nebraska World Wide Web Services such as the Nebraska State Government Home Page, the Office of the Governor Home Page, and the Community Information Technology Home Page.

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: Yes, through the porting of information

Directory services used: No

Digital signatures used: Planned

Server growth projected: Server capability will be upgraded in the near future - December 1999

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: Nebraska is considering publishing an official information privacy policy.

Individuals with disabilities: INA

Language/literacy barriers: INA

Access to Internet resources: INA

Policies on charging for public information: INA

Customer feedback/needs assessment: INA

Marketing: INA

Lessons Learned:

Nebraska is a contracting state. Its web portal Nebraska@Online, is well organized and easy to navigate. It is clear from the links what services are free and which services require a subscription.

New York

Scope: A white paper is being developed by the New York State Forum for Information Resources Management (a voluntary network of public officials organized to promote policies and practices for effective use and management of information resources in New York State government). The paper outlines four specific actions that New York could undertake to develop e-commerce for government. These proposed actions include fostering strong leadership, marshalling resources, and promoting buy-in at the highest levels

Portal Name: Not yet determined by state

Internet Address: Not yet determined for statewide portal

Launch Date: Not yet determined.

Portal Catalyst(s): NYS Office for Technology, with support from the NYS Office of State Comptroller, NYS Office of General Services, New York State Forum for Information Resources Management

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: Electronic Signatures and Records Act provides a broad statewide approach intended to make it easier for businesses and consumers to use technology. The Electronic Value Transfer Act provides for State agencies to accept payment from customers via credit cards, debit cards and other forms of electronic payment.

Portal Oversight: INA

Portal Management: NYS Office for Technology

Agency Participation: Participation is not required. Agencies and local governments are authorized and empowered but not required to produce, receive, accept, acquire, record, file, transmit, forward, and store information through electronic means.

Services:

Business-related: Tax links from current Department of Taxation and Finance web page for employer withholding and wage reporting.

General Public: Tax links from current Department of Taxation and Finance web page for electronic filing of personal income taxes. Online motor vehicle registration is also available.

Using Credit Cards: Statewide RFP under development through the Department of Taxation and Finance for acceptance of electronic payments. Certain agencies, for example, Parks and Recreation accept payment via credit card through arrangements with private vendors).

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment:

Evaluation process in place: Electronic Value Transfer Act requires an analysis of business impact for any proposed use of credit cards. This process will go into effect after completion of EVTA RFP award. Use of electronic signatures and electronic records will be evaluated in a series of reports from the NYS Office for Technology to the Governor and Legislature.

Impact on participating agencies: NA

Impact on business community: NA

Public impact: NA

Impact to the state overall: NA

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: INA

Directory services used: INA

Digital signatures used for top level authentication: INA

Server growth projected: INA

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: A personal privacy protection section is included in Electronic Signatures and Records Act. A variety of State laws cover privacy of certain types of information (e.g. pertaining to personal records on AIDS, mental health, taxes).

Individuals with disabilities: There is a statewide policy requiring state agencies to comply with web accessibility guidelines.

Language/literacy barriers: The state web page has a link to the Ethnic/Minority Outreach Project.

Access to Internet resources: INA

Policies on charging for public information: State Freedom of Information Law (FOIL).

Customer feedback/needs assessment: The state web page has a link entitled "WANTED: Your Opinion!"

Marketing: INA

Lessons Learned: INA

Ohio

Scope: No portal initiative. The Ohio Department of Administrative Services disseminates guidelines for developing websites, offers website development services, and coordinates a production website for state agencies to use. Agencies create content that is housed on the Ohio Department of Administrative Services' servers. These services are free to state agencies.

Portal Name: NA

Internet Address: <http://www.state.oh.us/>

Launch Date: 1995

Portal Catalyst(s): NA

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: NA

Portal Oversight: NA

Portal Management: Ohio Department of Administrative Services.

Agency Participation: Participation is not required

Services:

Business-related: A link for doing business with Ohio is available off the State Front Page which includes state procurement resources, business and economic development information, a business filing and information center, assistance for small businesses and home businesses, Ohio economic development facts, and Ohio's electronic commerce program.

General Public: Many database searches are offered including unclaimed funds, job postings, licensed professionals (doctors, accountants, nurses, etc.), incarcerated felons, children available for adoption, childcare programs, water wells, Ohio laws, and K-12 school report cards and proficiency test results. Numerous forms can be downloaded and/or filed electronically.

Using Credit Cards: Yes, for a pilot project for licensure renewal beginning December 1999.

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment:

Evaluation process in place: Yes

Impact on participating agencies: Need for clerical/phone staff declines as information is made available on the website.

Impact on business community: INA

Public impact: INA

Impact to the state overall: INA

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: NA

Directory services used: LDAP

Digital signatures used for top level authentication: No, but directory service supports digital signatures. Legislation is pending to support electronic signatures because the legal effect of documents signed electronically in Ohio is currently uncertain. A pilot project using PKI technology for digital signatures is currently in production.

Server growth projected: Yes, but not as a formal process. Recently made decision to use cluster servers for ease of adding servers when needed. Will order two new servers shortly.

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: Yes, the policy is in the approval process.

Individuals with disabilities: Ohio's Internet Advisory Committee developed best practices for state website development to assist agencies in creating universally accessible pages.

Language/literacy barriers: INA

Access to Internet resources: All Ohio libraries and K-12 public schools are equipped with web-linked PCs.

Policies on charging for public information: Ohio does not charge, nor do we plan to charge, for any web-based services to access public information.

Customer feedback/needs assessment: Comments to the webmaster, site tracking and statistics are used in the annual evaluation of the efficacy of Ohio's website.

Marketing: No

Lessons Learned: In exchange for using the free web support services provided by the Department of Administrative Services, agencies must commit to complying with some minimal requirements, e.g., naming conventions, browser independence, supported software tools, etc.

Launch agency websites only upon approval of agency top management.

Encourage unlimited agency participation in a statewide Internet Advisory Committee for information sharing to avoid overlapping initiatives and promote information sharing. Use listservs and websites for sharing ideas and resolving issues.

Develop websites using a team approach: designers are lousy programmers, programmers are poor designers, and neither is usually sensitive to political issues.

Pennsylvania

Scope: An enterprise portal approach is in the planning stages. Pennsylvania has just completed the first phase (a pilot) of a three-phase project to establish an enterprise-wide web-based portal for government access. The second phase is due to be completed in three more months, with subsequent phases rolled out over the next 12-18 months, providing increasingly more functional style government, thus offering a single face to the public and Pennsylvania's business, local government, and education communities. All common functions across agencies, such as forms, will be developed by the Governor's Office of Administration/ Office for Information Technology and will eventually include local governments and school districts. Individual agencies will remain responsible for developing services for unique functions.

Portal Name: INA

Internet Address: <http://www.state.pa.us>

Launch Date: 1999

Portal Catalyst(s): Governor's Office

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: INA

Portal Oversight: A Governing Board is in place, serving as a steering committee made of key decision-makers from selected agencies.

Portal Management: State agency: Governor's Office of Administration/ Office for IT

Agency Participation: Participation is required according to standards and guidelines that are being developed.

Services:

Business-related: Filing information and all forms will be available from one website

General Public: At this time, content is informational.

Using Credit Cards: Current use is on a limited basis; however, a number of agencies are preparing and implementing this functionality to become operational in the first half of 2000.

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment:

Evaluation process in place: Yes

Impact on participating agencies: Reduction in transaction processing time for forms that can be filled out and submitted via the web. For instance, the time to process the PA-100 form that all businesses must submit in order to do business in Pennsylvania, was reduced from 3-6 weeks to 2-3 days. Agency personnel can now assist customers with the form rather than push paper and provide proactive customer services.

Impact on business community: Data will be entered only once as forms are linked across government agencies. Forms and permits will be processed faster, reducing waiting time for businesses to be up and running.

Public impact: Some reduced fees for registering online and more rapid response rates will encourage the use of the web.

Impact to the state overall: All data collected from forms will be linked and shared throughout state government, reducing data entry, data error, increasing accuracy, and providing consistency.

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: Yes

Directory services used: Right now architecture calls for the use of Microsoft's ADSI (Active Directory Service Interface) v2.0 prior to implementation of Windows 2000.

Digital signatures used for top level authentication: Legislation has passed in both of Pennsylvania's legislative bodies, and is in Committee resolution. The Governor's Office of Administration/Office for Information Technology is finalizing enterprise standards that will be implemented as soon as the legislation is made law via the Governor's signature. Certain applications are currently using digital signature and authentication technology; however, wide-scale general use of this technology by all other agencies awaits the finalization of this legislation.

Server growth projected: INA

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: An enterprise privacy policy statement is in development for issuance in the first quarter of 2000. Possible legislative involvement and oversight is also being discussed with the legislature.

Individuals with disabilities: Current enterprise standards provide resources for the visually impaired.

Language/literacy barriers: INA

Access to Internet resources: INA

Policies on charging for public information: Policy is most government information is provided to the general public at no costs. Some information provided to businesses is done at a nominal cost. Charges for information available via the Internet are limited and rare in nature—all general information is available at no cost.

Customer feedback/needs assessment: Customer feedback, at this time, consists of the ability to communicate with the agency directly via email, or address issues or concerns directly with the state's webmaster.

Marketing: Yes

Lessons Learned: Pennsylvania created two advisory committees, one composed of top decision-makers in key agencies, the other composed of select CIO's from non-information technology-related Fortune 500 companies based in Pennsylvania. Initiatives are taken to either or both advisory committees for feedback and input. State agencies also look to these private sector CIO's for advice and best practices. Staff fear of change and possible job loss were alleviated through education and inclusion in the decision-making process. The Governor's office has established, or is in process of establishing an enterprise portal architecture and related enterprise policies and standards. Agencies are encouraged to use the standards through funding controls.

Utah*

Scope: Operational enterprise portal using a private partner as the site manager.

Portal Name: e-Utah

Internet Address: <http://www.state.ut.us/>

Launch Date: August 1999

Portal Catalyst(s): Governor's Office

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: Digital State legislation was enrolled in 1999 (<http://www.le.state.ut.us/~1999/bills/sbillenr/SB0188.htm>); and a digital signatures law was passed in 1995 (<http://www.commerce.state.ut.us/digsig/dsmain.htm>). A Governor's [executive order](#) created an advisory body, the Utah Electronic Commerce Council that advises the CIO and the Governor. The CIO has full authority to enter into contracts, according to [the Information Technology Act](#).

Portal Oversight: Utah Electronic Commerce Council advisory board to the CIO - created by executive order

Portal Management: Private partner

Agency Participation: Participation is not required. Initial agencies participating in the development of state portal include the CIO's office, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Public Safety, the Department of Human Services, and the Tax Commission.

Services:

Business-related: Business guide to doing business in Utah (<http://www.dced.state.ut.us/NAV/library/bizutah/title.htm>); planned services include record searches (e.g., motor vehicle, recreational vehicle, driving record, investigative, corporate standing, and credit search); information to support business startups; UCC registrations; worker compensation filings; environmental reports, permits, and grant and loan management

General Public: General links, maps, and other informational services (<http://www.state.ut.us/government/c2g.html>); also payment services for traffic tickets and fees; employment applications

Using Credit Cards: Operational

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment:

Evaluation process in place: INA

Impact on participating agencies: INA

Impact on business community: INA

Public impact: INA

Impact to the state overall: INA

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: Planned

Directory services used: INA

Digital signatures used for top level authentication: The State of Utah adopted the Utah Digital Signature Act on February 27, 1995, and thus became the first jurisdiction in the world to implement an electronic authentication legal infrastructure using Digital Signature technology.

Server growth projected: INA

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: INA

Individuals with disabilities: "Bobby" Compliant

Language/literacy barriers: INA

Access to Internet resources: INA

Policies on charging for public information: Access charges for all transactions (now and future) are approved by the UECC as each application is prioritized and decided upon. Many will be free and there will be no data access charge.

Customer feedback/needs assessment: There is an online survey form
(<http://www.state.ut.us/questionair.html>)

Marketing: INA

Lessons Learned: INA

Virginia*

Scope: Operational enterprise portal with the following goal: to improve access to free information while also building value-added services for commercially-viable information of interest to the business community.

Portal Name: VIPNet (Virginia Information Providers Network Authority)

Internet Address: www.vipnet.org or www.state.va.us

Launch Date: March 18, 1998

Portal Catalyst(s): Governor's Office

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: The Virginia Internet Policy Act (<http://www.sotech.state.va.us/gcoit/gcmeet1.htm>) and the VIPNet authorizing language: (<http://www.vipnet.org/vipnet/history/vipnetcode.html>)

Portal Oversight: Virginia Information Providers Network Authority is governed by an 11-member board of directors. Five members are from the private sector and six members are from the public sector. The Secretary of Technology, the Deputy Secretary of Technology and the Executive Director of the Department of Technology Planning are members of the Authority governing board. The Secretary of Technology has policy responsibility for VIPNet. The Secretary of Technology is also charged with developing a blueprint for state government information technology planning and decision-making. The Council on Technology Services (COTS) supports the Secretary in this initiative.

Portal Management: Virginia Interactive, LLC

Agency Participation: Agency participation is optional. Initial participants included the Department of Motor Vehicles, Virginia Code Commission, the Department of Forestry, the Council on Indians, and the Frontier Culture Museum. Now state and local entities have partnered with VIPNet on over 120 projects. The state policy on agency reimbursement is available at <http://www.vipnet.org/vipnet/history/vipnetcode.html#9-364>.

Services: All information and services provided by VIPNet are available at no charge except for VIPNet's premium services. Premium services are those information resources for which the Network provides enhanced access or other value-added services and for which a fee is assessed. Currently, VIPNet offers the following premium services: Electronic access to Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) records; Electronic access to the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries (DGIF); Boat Registration Database; Lobbyist-in-a-Box Web-based bill tracking service, developed in partnership with the Virginia General Assembly's Division of Legislative Automated Systems (DLAS)

Business-related: Department of Motor Vehicles services, including motor carrier services and dealer services.

General Public: weblinks to state government agencies; DMV services

Using Credit Cards: Lobbyists are able to register on-line using credit cards.

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment:

Evaluation process in place: INA

Impact on participating agencies: Network Manager's staff serves as an adjunct to the agency staff for those projects on which the agency and VIPNet partner.

Impact on business community: Business now has an intermediary to go to with requests for Web-access to government information.

Public impact: Now over 60 free applications have been made available to the public and 60 more are in various stages of development. None of the applications that VIPNet has developed have used government tax dollars or subsidies.

Impact to the state overall: INA

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: Yes, application links to agency databases for dynamic data; porting of agency information for less dynamic data

Directory services used: INA

Digital signatures used for top level authentication: Working with the Secretary of Technology's digital signature workgroup. Will be participating on 5-7 pilot projects involving digital signatures.

Server growth projected: Eight servers currently in place. Will add more as demand increases

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: The state has a policy on public records open to inspection, and the procedure for requesting records and responding to request and charges is available at: <http://leg1.state.va.us/cgi-bin/legp504.exe?000+cod+2.1-342>; There is also a policy on access to public information, the receipt of information, and on the application of statutory restrictions on confidentiality to VIPNet Authority: <http://www.vipnet.org/vipnet/history/vipnetcode.html#9-365>

Individuals with disabilities: Accessibility Compliance statement and feedback mechanism are available (<http://www.vipnet.org/access.html>)

Language/literacy barriers: INA

Public access to Internet resources: INA

Policies on charging for public information: Policy on public records to be open to inspection; procedure for requesting records and responding to request and charges: <http://leg1.state.va.us/cgi-bin/legp504.exe?000+cod+2.1-342>

Customer feedback/needs assessment: User feedback capability on information privacy: <http://www.vipnet.org/privacy.html>

Marketing: Network Manager's staff has a marketing department that trains both public and private users on the various applications developed. Marketing department conducts focus groups as needed. Marketing department attends conferences and operates a demonstration booth that highlights VIPNet applications.

Lessons Learned: A special fund was established to enable the VIPNet Authority's acceptance of private donations (<http://www.vipnet.org/vipnet/history/vipnetcode.html#9-368>;). Also, agencies are reimbursed for costs incurred to provide electronic access to information and electronic transactions.

Washington

Scope: Washington is transforming the relationship between citizens and state government with a new model of digital government. Unprecedented access to government information and services through its *Access Washington* Internet portal puts citizens in charge of their relationship with government. Operational state portal takes the state-run enterprise approach. A central office develops guidelines and standards that agencies follow. The state is considering the self-funding model of a private partnership but has not determined yet if this is the best path.

Portal Name: *Access Washington*

Internet Address: <http://access.wa.gov/>

Launch Date: November 18, 1998

Portal Catalysts: Governor's Office

Related Legislation/Rules/Guidelines: Credit and Debit Card Acceptance Standards
(<http://www.ofm.wa.gov/policy/40.10.htm>);

Portal Oversight: Cabinet-level subcommittee chaired by Governor's chief of staff and the Governor's technology advisor (includes the Department of Information Services, the Information Services Board, the Sub-cabinet on Management, and the E-commerce Steering Committee).

Portal Management: The Department of Information Services (DIS) is a discretionary use "fee for service" agency within state government.

Agency Participation: Agency participation is not required but is encouraged.

Services available through the portal:

Business-related: Electronic tax filing; state business records inquiry (required by law to make information available to the public regarding businesses registered with the Department); contractor registration inquiry; links to SBA; on-line "licensing library" that provides information on federal, state, county and city licensing; links to the business development program work to attract new domestic and international investment, assist in the creation of family-wage jobs and serve as a business advocate; resources for anyone interested in doing business with Washington's public agencies; guide to Washington's Chambers of Commerce; online scheduling for electrical inspections; environmental permit assistance; prevailing wage rates; labor market information and WORK job search service allowing employers to post job openings and review potential candidates' resumes.

General Public: includes daily state government news service for general public and news media (over 45 state agencies contribute news – over 1,900 news releases posted); unclaimed property; personalized plate inquiry; criminal history lookup; health care and social services links; winning lottery numbers; outdoor recreation; agency links; employment opportunities; earthquake information; vehicle tax calculations; digital postcards of Washington scenes; links just for kids; the WaWizQuiz.

Using Credit Cards: Yes (credit cards).

Approach to Cost/Benefit Assessment:

Evaluation process in place: An economic feasibility plan should demonstrate the cost effectiveness of accepting credit/debit cards or similar devices. Agencies should consider all factors relating to costs and savings associated with accepting credit/debit cards and other similar devices in their plan.

Impact on participating agencies: incremental costs to incorporate "look and feel" of website; each agency tracks any revenues received from portal operations; this is not tracked centrally; no change in

agency fees as yet; adapting a common look and feel to agency websites has affected some internal agency processes (a common style guide is used by all agencies)

Impact on business community: INA

Public impact: citizen feedback re: need for online government

Impact to the state overall: Winner of Digital State Award two years in a row from Progress and Freedom Foundation. *Access Washington* is also the winner of the Business on the Internet (BOTI) Award; the NASIRE Recognition Award for Best Service Application; *Government Technology* magazine's Best of the Web Award for Best State Government Web Site; and the Washington Software Alliance Industry Achievement Award Finalist for Best Web Site. Agencies have used templates and style guides when building their websites; they have also participated in statewide security architecture, digital signature, and electronic payment filing.

Technical Aspects:

Legacy systems supported: Yes.

Directory services used: In design now.

Digital signatures used for top level authentication: In design now.

Server growth projected: INA

End-User Needs and Accessibility Issues:

Information privacy: Privacy policies are being developed.

Individuals with disabilities: INA

Language/literacy barriers: INA

Access to Internet resources: INA

Policies on charging for public information: Decisions are left to the individual agencies.

Customer feedback/needs assessment: An e-mail feedback mechanism is available to the public.

Marketing: Yes.

Lessons Learned: Cooperative efforts are key for e-commerce. Developing an organizational structure that "works" is very challenging. Interagency collaboration is essential. Privacy and security policies and processes are key to gaining agency acceptance and participation. Cost benefit analysis is very difficult when parallel services need to be maintained. Bottom line issues are not the only criteria for measuring benefit. Questions must be resolved as to "whose" benefit: the public or the agencies? State provides guides for preparing an Economic Feasibility Plan (<http://www.ofm.wa.gov/policy/401080.pdf>):

- Costs include amounts paid to a third party for accepting credit/debit cards or other similar device, equipment costs including telephone and maintenance expenses; additional labor costs related to processing payments made by credit/debit cards or other similar devices.
- Savings/benefits include use of float by the agency (reduced dollar days outside treasury); reduced bank fees that would be charged for payments made by cash or checks; reduced costs associated with handling cash, theft or pilferage, storage, and security and transit of handling and holding cash; reduced costs of handling checks; reduced dishonored check costs; decreased facility needs; increased collection of mandated payments; reduced paperwork; reduced in-person transactions; and reduced accounts receivable processing costs.

Appendix A: Helpful Websites

Information/Internet economy:

- The Global Information Infrastructure Commission (<http://gii.org/focus/ecommerce/>)
- The Internet Economy Indicators (<http://www.internetindicators.com>)
- The National Information Infrastructure (<http://nii.nist.gov/nii/niiinfo.html>)
- The President's Information Infrastructure Task Force (<http://www.iitf.nist.gov/about.html>)

General information about e-commerce/e-government:

- Center for Technology in Government (<http://www.ctg.albany.edu/>)
- CIO Communications Inc. (<http://www.cio.com>)
- Digital Government Institute (<http://www.digitalgovernment.com>)
- Electronic Process Initiatives Committee of the President's Management Council (<http://policyworks.gov/epic>)
- Federal Electronic Commerce Program Office (<http://ec.fed.gov/ecwshop/agenda.htm>)
- Government Ecommerce Sites (<http://www.wolfenet.com/~dhillis/govecommerce6229.htm>)
- National Association of State Information Resource Executives (<http://www.nasire.org>)
- SmartGov: (<http://policyworks.gov/smartgov>)
- Texas Electronic Commerce Association (<http://www2.outer.net/texasecomm/default.html>)
- The Alliance for Redesigning Government: <http://www.alliance.napawash.org/alliance>
- The National Electronic Commerce Coordinating Council (<http://www.ec3.org>)
- United States Government Electronic Commerce Policy (<http://www.ecommerce.gov>)

End-user issues:

- The Benton Foundation (<http://www.benton.org/>)
- Center For Democracy and Technology (<http://www.cdt.org>)
- Compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA):
<http://www.johnco.cc.ks.us/acad/etc/technotes/ada.htm>, <http://www.magnet.state.ma.us/webmass/ada.htm>,
<http://www.thompson.com/tpg/person/able/ablelink.html>, and <http://www.usdoj.gov/crt/ada/adahom1.htm>
- Falling Through the Net: Defining the Digital Divide" <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/fttn99/contents.html>

Information privacy:

- Electronic Privacy Information Center (http://www.epic.org/privacy/privacy_resources_faq.html)
- Information Privacy: An Annotated Resource List: (<http://www.nocall.org/privbib.html>)
- Privacy & Encryption Clearinghouse
(http://www.ec3.org/InfoCenter/09_LinkSites/Clearinghouse_privacy.htm)
- Privacy Journal: (<http://www.townonline.com/privacyjournal/>)

Appendix B: Glossary

Internet-related materials and information are often laden with acronyms and technical terms that are sometimes confusing. In particular, discussions about e-government involve distinctions between and among terms such as portal, gateway, and e-commerce. The following glossary has been provided to clarify terms used in the body of this report. In most cases, the definitions that follow are direct quotes from various sources that have been cited for additional reference purposes.

Digital cash is a digitally signed payment message that serves as a medium of exchange.⁸ Digital cash is a system of purchasing cash credits in relatively small amounts, storing the credits in your computer, and then spending them when making electronic purchases over the Internet. Theoretically, digital cash could be spent in very small increments, such as tenths of a cent (U.S.) or less. Most merchants accepting digital cash so far, however, use it as an alternative to other forms of payment for somewhat higher price purchases. There are several commercial approaches to digital cash on the Web. Among these are eCash from DigiCash and Cybercash.⁹

A digital certificate is an electronic "credit card" that establishes credentials when doing business or other transactions on the Web. A certificate is issued by a certification authority (CA). It contains a name, a serial number, expiration dates, a copy of the certificate holder's public key (used for encrypting and decrypting messages and digital signatures), and the digital signature of the certificate-issuing authority so that a recipient can verify that the certificate is real. Some digital certificates conform to a standard such as X.509. Digital certificates can be kept in registries so that authenticated users can look up other users' public keys.¹⁰

A digital signature: A digital code that uniquely identifies the sender and which is usually attached to an electronically transmitted message.¹¹ A digital signature (not to be confused with a digital certificate) is an electronic rather than a written signature that can be used by someone to authenticate the identity of the sender of a message or of the signer of a document. It can also be used to ensure that the original content of the message or document that has been conveyed is unchanged. Additional benefits to the use of a digital signature are that it is easily transportable, cannot be easily repudiated, cannot be imitated by someone else, and can be automatically time-stamped.¹²

A directory is, in general, an approach to organizing information, the most familiar example being a telephone directory. 1) On the World Wide Web, a directory is a subject guide, typically organized by major topics and subtopics. The best-known directory is the one at Yahoo (<http://www.yahoo.com>). Many other sites now use a Yahoo-like directory including major portal sites. 2) In computer file systems, a directory is a named group of related files that are separated by the naming convention from other groups of files.¹³

Electronic commerce: Conducting business on-line. This includes, for example, buying and selling products with digital cash and via Electronic Data Interchange (EDI).¹⁴ A more formal definition of electronic commerce is commercial activity that takes place by digital processes over a computer network, usually the Internet, between and among entities in the private sector, government institutions, and/or members of the public. These activities generally involve the electronic exchange of information to acquire or provide products or services, to place or receive orders, to provide or obtain information, and to complete financial transactions.

Electronic government (e-government): Government activities that takes place by digital processes over a computer network, usually the Internet, between the government and members of the public and entities in the private sector, especially regulated entities. These activities generally involve the electronic exchange of information to acquire or provide products or services, to place or receive orders, to provide or obtain information, or to complete financial transactions. The anticipated benefits of e-government include reduced operating costs for

⁸ Source: <http://www.aci.net/kalliste/digiprin.htm>

⁹ Source: <http://www.whatis.com/digitalc.htm>

¹⁰ Source: <http://www.whatis.com/>

¹¹ Source: http://www.globeset.com/Commerce/Glossary/d.shtml#digital_signature

¹² Source: <http://www.whatis.com/>

¹³ Source: <http://www.whatis.com/>

¹⁴ Source: http://webopedia.internet.com/TERM/e/electronic_commerce.html

government institutions and regulated entities, increased availability since government services can be accessed from virtually any location, and convenience due to round-the-clock availability. In addition, electronic government provides direct communications between legislators and their constituents via e-mail.

Encryption is the conversion of data into a form, called a cipher, that cannot be easily understood by unauthorized people. Decryption is the process of converting encrypted data back into its original form, so it can be understood.¹⁵

Full transactional service: A full transactional service allows end users to complete a transaction online. An example would be the ability both to complete an online form and submit it to the appropriate agency electronically. [See also "Limited transactional service" below.]

Gateway: see Portal and Web portal definitions.

The **Internet**, sometimes called simply "the Net," is a worldwide system of computer networks - a network of networks in which users at any one computer can, if they have permission, get information from any other computer (and sometimes talk directly to users at other computers). It was conceived by the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) of the U.S. government in 1969 and was first known as the ARPANet.¹⁶

Limited transactional service: A limited transactional service does not provide complete interactional functionality. For example, a limited transaction service would allow an end user to download a form; however, the user would need to complete the form off-line and then mail it back to the agency using traditional postal procedures.

Portal: Usually used as a marketing term to describe a Web site that is or is intended to be the first place people see when using the Web. Typically a "portal site" has a catalog of web sites, a search engine, or both. A portal site may also offer email and other service to entice people to use that site as their main "point of entry" or "gateway" (hence "portal") to the Web.¹⁷ [See also "Web portal" below.]

Public key infrastructure (PKI): The set of security services that enable the use and management of public-key cryptography and certificates, including key, certificate, and policy management.¹⁸

Web portal : A Web site or service that offers a broad array of resources and services, such as e-mail, forums, search engines, and on-line shopping malls. The first Web portals were online services, such as America Online (AOL), that provided access to the Web, but by now most of the traditional search engines have transformed themselves into Web portals to attract and keep a larger audience.¹⁹

World Wide Web, usually referred to as the "Web," is all the resources and users on the Internet that are using the Hypertext Transfer Protocol (HTTP).²⁰ Pages on the Web can contain graphics, text, audio, and video.

X.500 Directory Service is a standard way to develop an electronic directory of people in an organization so that it can be part of a global directory available to anyone in the world with Internet access. Such a directory is sometimes called a global White Pages directory. The idea is to be able to look up people in a user-friendly way by name, department, or organization. Many enterprises and institutions have created an X.500 directory. Because these directories are organized as part of a single global directory, users can search for hundreds of thousands of people from a single place on the World Wide Web. The X.500 directory is organized under a common "root" directory in a "tree" hierarchy of country, organization, organizational unit, and person. An entry at each of these levels must have certain attributes; some can have optional ones established locally. Each organization can implement a directory in its own way as long as it adheres to the basic schema or plan. The distributed global directory works through a registration process and one or more central places that manage many directories.²¹

¹⁵ Source: <http://www.whatis.com/>

¹⁶ Source: <http://www.whatis.com/>

¹⁷ Source: <http://www.matisse.net/files/glossary.html#P>

¹⁸ Source: http://www.globeset.com/Commerce/Glossary/p.shtml#public_key_infrastructure

¹⁹ Source: http://webopedia.internet.com/TERM/W/Web_portal.html

²⁰ Source: <http://www.whatis.com/>

²¹ Source: <http://www.whatis.com/>

Appendix C: Survey Form

Survey Instructions: This survey contains three sets of questions that can be answered via email. The first section addresses general information about your state's overall direction with regard to electronic government. The second section focuses on your e-government project or service. In the third section, a space is provided for you to indicate your willingness to participate in a follow-up telephone conversation.

Most of the items in this survey are in short-answer or multiple choice format. Feel free to indicate your answers simply by typing an "x" in the space(s) provided, etc. For short-answer questions, please type your reply directly beneath the question. If you do not know the answer to a question or do not have time to reply to it, feel free to leave it blank for now. Thank you!

I. General Overview of Your State's e-government Initiatives or Projects

- 1) What is the general status of electronic government (e-government) initiatives in your state?
☐ Have only implemented agency-level projects; no statewide initiative is underway
☐ Have implemented statewide pilot only
☐ Have conducted statewide pilot and now offer full service transactional services
☐ Now offer full service transactional services but did not pilot the service first
☐ Are considering e-government at this time
- 2) What agency/organization oversees your state's e-government policies, planning and standards?
- 3) Would you like to receive a copy of the survey results ?
☐ Yes (please include email address)
☐ No

II. Information about an e-government project

A. General Information

- 1) Was this service/ project legislatively mandated or authorized?
☐ Yes (please specify Bill Number)
☐ No
☐ Don't know

If yes, was specific funding attached?
- 2) Service / Project type:
☐ Web Portal for Access to State Government
☐ Non-Internet Online System
☐ Other (please specify)
- 3) Are all state agencies required to use the service / project?
☐ Yes
☐ No
- 4) Which agencies/ political entities participated in the development of the service / project?
- 5) Which agency/administrative unit oversees implementation of this service / project?
☐ governing board (please specify)
☐ agency (please specify)
☐ other (please specify)

- 6) Which agency / administrative unit oversees the completed project?
 ____governing board (please specify)
 ____agency (please specify)
 ____other (please specify)
- 7) Who is responsible for day-to-day management of this project?
 ____ State agency: (please specify)
 ____ Contracting company
 ____ Other (please specify)
- 8) How many staff are devoted to maintaining this project?
 Contracted
 ____full-time
 ____part-time

 State agency employees
 ____full-time
 ____part-time
- 9) What are the project's help desk hours of operation?
 ____24x7
 ____Other (please specify)
- 10) Did you develop a formalized marketing plan to promote public use of this service?
 ____Yes
 ____No
 ____Don't know
- 11) How long has this service / project been in place?
- 12) What is the approximate number of users per month?
- 13) What is the approximate number of transactions per month?

B. Costs/Benefits

- 14) It is possible that vendors may absorb some of the initial costs in such a program. How were the startup costs associated with this project apportioned?
- For Equipment? ____state____vendor____other (please specify - \$ or %)
- For Personnel? ____state____vendor____other (please specify - \$ or %)
- Other? ____state____vendor____other (please specify - \$ or %)
- Don't know
- 15) What are the approximate ongoing costs associated with this project?
- For Equipment? ____state____vendor____other (please specify)
- For Personnel? ____state____vendor____other (please specify)
- Other? ____state____vendor____other (please specify)

Don't know

- 16) Did implementation of this service have an effect upon participating agencies' costs in any way?
___ Yes. If yes were costs higher or lower and approximate amount. _____
___ No
___ Don't know
- 17) Did implementation of this service have an effect upon participating agencies' revenues in any way?
___ Yes. If yes were revenues higher or lower and approximate amount. _____
___ No
___ Don't know
- 18) Have there been any increases or decreases in standard agency fees for services as a result of this project (e.g., license/certificate fees, etc.)
___ Yes. (please describe)
___ No
___ Don't know
- 19) Have any internal processes changed (at the agency level) as a result of this service (e.g., common data fields developed, etc)?
___ Yes. (please describe)
___ No
___ Don't know
- 20) If this project is contracted outside state government, are there any cost-sharing arrangements in place such as the following? (please 'x' all that apply):
___ No
___ Yes (please specify who shares the costs & how)
 ___ per transaction
 ___ % of total monthly/quarterly/yearly revenue
 ___ other (please specify)
- 21) If this project is contracted outside state government, are there any revenue-sharing arrangements in place? (please 'x' all that apply):
___ No
___ Yes (please specify who shares the revenues & how)
 ___ per transaction
 ___ % of total monthly/quarterly/yearly revenue
 ___ other (please specify)
- 22) Does the state or vendor repackage information and sell it as a "value-added service?"
___ Yes
___ No (if no, please skip the next two questions)
___ Don't know
- 23) If the service is contracted, what percentage of revenue from the value-added service does the state receive? (e.g., 10% of the revenue from value added services offered by vendor)
- 24) If the service is a state function, what revenues does the state realize from the value-added services offered from this project?
- 25) Do you have processes in place to track public use of each service? If yes, please "x" all that apply below.
___ #licenses issued
___ amount of fees paid
___ site visit counts (e.g., # visitors to web sites)

___#requests received for forms, reports, etc.
___other

26) Do you have a formalized evaluation process in place to assess public use of this service?

___Yes. If Yes, will you share the evaluation process? Results?
___No
___Don't know

27) Have you seen an increase in demand for new services offered electronically? If so, what types of services are being requested?

C. Technical Configuration

28) If contracting for the services / project, how is the data delivered to the contractor?

___application links to state database
___porting of information (copies of database) If so, how often_____
___other (please describe)

29) Does the contractor link to legacy mainframe applications and/or web enabled systems?

___yes (please specify how)
___no

30) If you have links to existing state systems, who developed the application program interface (API)?

___contractor (please specify)
___state
___other

31) Are agencies' legacy systems being supported? If so, how?

___porting information
___Other (please specify)

32) Have you implemented a directory service. If yes, what directory structures/standards are being used?

___x.500 (specify software)
___LDAP (specify software)
___Other (please specify)

33) Are digital signatures used for top level authentication?

___yes (if yes, what type of applications)
___no

34) Are there any "server" growth projections due to increased demand for e-government services?

D. Issues and Concerns

35) Did you publish an official information privacy policy as part of this project?

___Yes. If Yes, will you share the policy?
___No
___Don't know

36) Have there been any formal complaints from end-users or agencies about information privacy related to this project?

___Yes. If Yes, approximately how many? Any resolutions?
___No
___Don't know

- 37) Does your state have any policy and/or program regarding deployment of end-user terminals that can be used to access the service? If so, please describe briefly.
- 38) If applicable, has your state legislature facilitated or limited this activity in any way?
- 39) If applicable, have state agencies enabled or constrained this activity in any way?
- 40) If your state contracted for an e-government pilot project, then went to full implementation – was the contract re-bid after the pilot?
- ___ Yes
- ___ No

III. Questions for Follow-up Telephone Conversation

Would you be willing to participate in a follow-up conversation?

- ___ Yes (if yes, please continue with Contact Information below)
- ___ No

A. Contact Information

Your daytime telephone number, including area code: Best day time to contact you:

Please Specify day and Time: _____

B. Questions to Consider Prior to Follow-up Telephone Interview

1. How would you characterize your success so far? Problems encountered?
2. What, if any, sustainability problems/barriers have you encountered thus far?

Appendix D: Resources

Resources in this section include sample privacy policies, end-user feedback mechanisms from state sites, style sheets for agency development of web pages, and surveys and reports related to e-government initiatives.

A. Sample Privacy Policies

A study by the *Privacy Journal* (<http://www.townonline.com/privacyjournal/>) based in Providence, Rhode Island ranked California in the top tier of states with good privacy protection. Other states that the Journal ranked as "high" included Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New York, Rhode Island, and Wisconsin. California's Electronic Commerce Advisory Council has a report entitled *If I'm so empowered, why do I need you? Defining Government's Role in Internet Electronic Commerce*. The report is available at the following Internet location: <http://www.e-commerce.ca.gov/>

B. Sample End-User Feedback Mechanisms

Most state websites provide an email address where citizens can send in questions and comments. The best sites offer a public comment capability directly from the main page. What follows are just a few examples of mechanisms through which the public can provide feedback to state website/portal managers:

- Florida and Arkansas offer an email function that is prominent from the portal's main page: http://www.state.fl.us/fgsd_html/email.html and <http://www.state.ar.us/ina/question.html>
- Iowa makes a feedback form available to the public: <http://www.state.ia.us/main/contact/feedback.html>
- Maine provides a user feedback survey: <http://www.informe.org/contact/feedback.html>
- Massachusetts offers a vehicle for comments, suggestions, and corrections to the state's web pages: <http://www.state.ma.us/contact.htm>
- Utah provides a handy feedback form for public input on specific informational services, called "What kinds of business would you like to conduct with government?" It can be viewed at this address: <http://www.state.ut.us/questionair.html>
- Washington offers several types of information and opportunities for the public to interact through its Legal and Privacy Information page: <http://access.wa.gov/siteinfo/pdnotice.asp>. Washington's site also provides a way for the public to suggest additional links. To be eligible, the links should be to organizations supported by public funds, such as state agencies, cities, public non-profits, etc., or of general interest to Washington state citizens: <http://access.wa.gov/siteinfo/addlink.asp>

C. Sample Style Sheets and Web Guidelines

The state of Washington provides an example of a style guide that is intended to help agencies develop their own web pages. The guide includes information about HTML markup review, development tools, universal web design and other information which can simplify agency website development. It is available at the following Internet location: <http://www.wa.gov/dis/interactive/styleguide/>

D. Surveys, Reports and Related Research

The DIR research team consulted several additional sources of information as background to this survey project. These sources include subscription-based services available on CD-ROM as well as several online sources, e-commerce magazines and publications, and government association websites.

Cain, M. *Enterprise Portals: A Publishing Model*. [CD-ROM]. Stamford, CT: META Group, Inc, October 21, 1999.

Folger, D. *Enterprise Portal Taxonomy*. [CD-ROM]. Stamford, CT: META Group, Inc, September 15, 1999.

Gotta, M. *Categorizing Portals*. [CD-ROM]. Stamford, CT: META Group, Inc, September 15, 1999.

Gotta, M. *Portals: More Than a Pretty (Inter)Face*. [CD-ROM]. Stamford, CT: META Group, Inc, September 17, 1999.

- Integrated Service Delivery: Governments Using Technology to Serve the Citizen - International, Federal, State, and Local Government Experiences*. [Online]. August 1999. U.S. General Services Administration. Available: <http://policyworks.gov/org/main/mg/intergov/advisoryframe.html> [Accessed December 13, 1999].
- Kelly, C. *E-Government (The Supply Side): Part 1: The Supplier View*. [CD-ROM]. Stamford, CT: META Group, Inc, November 16, 1999.
- Kelly, C. *E-Government (The Supply Side): Part 2: The Architecture*. [CD-ROM]. Stamford, CT: META Group, Inc, November 16, 1999.
- Kelly, C. *E-Government Superstructure: Part 1 - Policy Prerequisites for Success*. [CD-ROM]. Stamford, CT: META Group, Inc, September 27, 1999.
- Kramer, J. and Paone, J. (1999). Digital Signatures: Tutorial. [Online]. Available: Faulkner Information Services <http://www.faulkner.com/products/faccts/00018093.HTM> [Accessed October 18, 1999].
- Magaziner, Ira. (August 1998). *Creating a Framework for Global Electronic Commerce*. Address at Aspen Summit 1998 - Cyberspace and the American Dream. [Online]. Available: http://www.pff.org/ira_magaziner.htm
- May, A. (1996). *One-Stop Shopping for Government Information*. Washington, D.C: National Conference of State Legislatures.
- META Group. *E-Government: Reducing Cycle Time and Cost through Citizen Self-Service*. [CD-ROM]. Stamford, CT: META Group, Inc, August 20, 1999.
- META Group. *Governance: The Public-Sector Scenario*. [CD-ROM]. Stamford, CT: META Group, Inc, July 26, 1999.
- National Electronic Commerce Coordinating Council. (1999). *Electronic Payments Primer*. Washington, DC: National Electronic Commerce Coordinating Council. [Online]. Available: http://www.ec3.org/InfoCenter/02_WorkGroups/ElectronicPayments/Studies/primer.pdf
- National Electronic Commerce Coordinating Council. (no date). *EC Transactions and Funding Survey*. [Online]. Available: http://www.ec3.org/InfoCenter/02_WorkGroups/ECTransactions/Surveys/survey1.htm
- National Electronic Commerce Coordinating Council. (no date). *Electronic Payment Services Survey*. [Online]. Available: http://www.ec3.org/InfoCenter/02_WorkGroups/ElectronicPayments/Surveys/survey.pdf
- National Electronic Commerce Coordinating Council. (no date). *Financial Electronic Data Interchange – Survey of the States*. [Online]. Available: http://www.ec3.org/InfoCenter/02_WorkGroups/EProcurement/Surveys/survey.pdf
- National Electronic Commerce Coordinating Council. (no date). *Purchasing Electronic Commerce Systems - Vendor Survey*. [Online]. Available: http://www.ec3.org/InfoCenter/02_WorkGroups/EProcurement/Surveys/survey.pdf
- National Electronic Commerce Coordinating Council. *What is Electronic Commerce? Electronic Commerce Issue Report No. 2*. [Online]. Available: http://www.ec3.org/InfoCenter/07_Publications/IssueReport002.htm [Accessed October 19, 1999].
- The National Electronic Coordinating Council and the Center for Digital Government. *Electronic Commerce: A Blueprint for States*. [Online]. Available: <http://www.naspo.org/ECCC/neccc99/presentations/whitepaper-draft.pdf>
- The Progress and Freedom Foundation. (1997). *The Digital State: How State Governments are Using Digital Technology*. Washington, DC: Progress and Freedom Foundation.
- The White House. (July 1, 1997). *A Framework for Global Electronic Commerce*. [Online]. Available: <http://www.ecommerce.gov/framework.htm> [Accessed November 11, 1999].
- Von Hoffman, C. (1999 November 15). The Making of E-Government: A research project has brought together governments and businesses to study the future of government in the digital economy. *CIO: Enterprise Section*, 49-52.

Appendix E: Summary Tables

The following series of tables summarizes the information received in the surveys. Column headings indicate survey questions.

I. General Overview

State	General Status	Oversight Agency or Organization
Arizona *	1	Government Information Technology Agency (GITA)
Arkansas *	4	Governing Board of Information Network of Arkansas
California	6	Department of Information Technology (DOIT)
Florida	1	Office of the Governor and State Technology Office
Georgia*	4	GeorgiaNet Authority
Idaho *	1	Information Technology Resource Management Council (ITRMC)
Indiana *	4	Intelenet Commission
Iowa *	3	State of Iowa Information Technology Services and IOWAccess Network Advisory Council
Kansas *	4	Governing Board of Information Network of Kansas
Maine *	3, 4	InforME Board
Massachusetts	4	Executive Office for Administration and Finance's Information Technology Division
Michigan	6	State CIO in the Department of Management and Budget
Mississippi	5	Strategic Services Division of the Mississippi Department of Information Technology Services
Nebraska *	4	Nebraska State Records Board (NSRB)
New York	6	INA
Ohio	6	NA
Pennsylvania	3	Governing Board in place serving as steering committee made of key decision-makers from selected agencies
Utah *	3	Utah Electronic Commerce Council advisory board to the CIO
Virginia *	6	Virginia Information Providers Network Authority
Washington	3,4	Cabinet-level subcommittee chaired by Governor's Chief of Staff and Governor's Technology Advisor

Key:

- 1 = Have only implemented agency-level projects; no statewide initiative is underway
- 2 = Have implemented statewide pilot only
- 3 = Have conducted statewide pilot and now offer full service transactional services
- 4 = Now offer full service transactional services but did not pilot the service first
- 5 = Are considering e-government at this time
- 6 = Statewide Initiative Underway
- INA = Information Not Available
- NA = Not Applicable
- * States that are contracting out their portal

II. Information about e-government projects

A. General Information

Surveys Received to Date:

	1. Web Portal: Enterprise Approach (E) or Limited/Other(L)	2. Mandated by Legislature(L), Governor(G), or Agency Initiative(A)	3. Agency participation optional?	4. Participants in the development the project State(S) or Contract(C)	5. Oversees implementation: Governing Board(G), State(S), Other(O)	6. Oversees the completed project: Governing Board (G), State(S), Other(O)	7. Responsible for day- to-day management, State(S) or Contract(C)	8. Staff is dedicated to the project, State(S) or Contract(C)	9. Hours of operation, 24x7 or Other(O)?	10. Formalized marketing plan was utilized? Yes(Y), No(N), In Planning (IP)	11. Launch Date: Less than 1yr(A), 1yr - 2yrs(B), 2yrs+(C)	12. Methods of Tracking Activity: Hits(H), Subscribers/Users(U), Transactions (T)	13. Transaction Volume: hits(H), Users(U), Searches(S), Dollars(D)
AZ*	E	A/CIO	Yes	S	S	G	S	S	O	Yes	A	INA	INA
AR*	E	L	Yes	S	G	G	C	S,C	24 x 7	No	C	H	H,U,S
CA	E	G	Yes	S,C	S	S	S	S	O	Yes	A	U	U
FL	L	INA	Yes	S	S	S	S	C	24 x 7	Yes	C	NA	H
ID*	E	L	Yes	S,C	O	O	O	C	O	Yes	A	NA	NA
IA*	E	A	Yes	S	S	S	S	S,C	24 x 7	Yes	B	H	INA
KS*	E	L	Yes	S,C	G	G,S	S,C	C	24 x 7	Yes	C	U	D
ME*	E	L	Yes	S	G	G	S	C	24 x 7	IP	A	INA	INA
MI	E	A	Yes	S	S	S	S	S	24 x7	Yes	C (1995)	H	H
MS	E	A	Yes	S	G,S	G,S	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA
NE*	E	L	Yes	S,C	G	G	C	S,C	24 x 7	Yes	C	H,U	H,S
OH	L	L	Yes	S	S	S	S	S	24 x 7	No	C	U	H
PA	E	G	No	S	G	G	S	S,C	O	Yes	A	U	INA
UT*	E	A/CIO	Yes	S	G,S	G,S	C	S,C	INA	No	A	INA	INA
VA*	E	G	INA	S	G	G	O	C	24 x 7	INA	B	H	INA
WA	E	G	Yes	S	S	S	S	S	24 x 7	Yes	B	H	INA

Surveys Not Received to Date:

GA*	E	L	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	C	INA	INA
IN*	E	L	Yes	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA
MA	L	A/CIO	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA
NY	INA	L	Yes	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA

Key:

- INA = Information Not Available
- NA = Not Applicable
- * States that are contracting out their portal

B. Costs/Benefits

Surveys Not Received to Date:

	14. Startup Costs: State(S), Vendor(V), Both(B)	15. Ongoing Costs: State(S), Vendor(V), Both (B)	16. Was there a cost impact to the Agency?	17. Revenue impact on Agency?	18. Portal result in a change of Agency Fees?	19. Impact on Agency Processes?	20. Cost-sharing Arrangements in place?	21. Revenue sharing: per transaction(T), % per month(M), Other(O)	22. Value added services available?	23. Percent to state for value-added services?	24. Revenues from value- added services?	25. Tracking Use of Service?	26. Evaluation process in place? Yes(Y), No(N), In Planning (IP)	27. Increase in demand for new services?
AZ*	B	B	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	T	Yes	INA	INA	1,2,3,4,5	Yes	Yes
AR*	V	V	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	T,M	No	INA	INA	1,2,3,4	No	Yes
CA	S	INA	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	INA	INA	5	Yes	NA
FL	INA	S	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	NA	Yes	1,2,3,4,5	Yes	Yes
ID*	V	V	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	Yes	0%	NA	NA	NA	NA
IA*	B	INA	INA	INA	No	No	No	No	INA	INA	INA	1,2,3,4	Yes	Yes
KS*	V	INA	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	T,M	Yes	90%	Yes	1,2,3,4	Yes	Yes
ME*	V100%	V100%	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	T	Yes	INA	Yes	INA	IP	INA
MI	INA	INA	Yes	INA	INA	Yes	NA	NA	No	INA	INA	1,2,3,4	Yes	Yes
MS	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
NE*	V	V	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	T,M	No	INA	INA	1,2,3,4	No	Yes
OH	S	INA	No	No	No	Yes	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	3,4	No	Yes
PA	S	INA	Yes	No	No	Yes	NA	NA	No	NA	No	3,4	No	Yes
UT*	V	INA	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	NA	NA	1,2,3,4	No	INA
VA*	V100%	INA	Yes	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	Yes	INA	NA	INA	INA	Yes
WA	V75%	S95%	No	INA	No	Yes	No	No	No	INA	INA	3	Yes	Yes

Surveys Not Received to Date:

GA*	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA
IN*	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	Yes	INA
MA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA
NY	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA

KEY

- Question 26: 1=# Licenses issued, 2=amount of fees paid, 3=site visit counts, 4=#requests received for forms, reports, etc, 5=other
- INA = Information Not Available
- NA = Not Applicable * States that are contracting out their portal

C. Technical Configuration

Surveys Not Received to Date:

	28. Method of data delivery to portal vendor: application links(A), porting of information(P)	29. Portal vendor link to legacy mainframe applications, and/or web enabled systems	30. API developer for #29: Contractor(C), State(S), Other(O)	31. Agency's Legacy systems supported: porting information(P), Other(O)	32. Directory Structure/Standards: x.500, LDPA, Other(O)	33. Digital Signatures used for top level authentication: Implemented(I), Planned(P)	34. New server growth projections, due to increased e-gov service demands
AZ*	A,P	Yes	C	P,O	x.500, LDPA, O	I	Yes
AR*	A,P	Yes	C,S	P	INA	P	Yes
CA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	I	NA
FL	A,P	Yes	P	C,S	LDPA	I	Yes
ID*	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
IA*	A	Yes	C	P	x.500	P	Yes
KS*	A,P	Yes	C	O	INA	No	Yes
ME*	A	Yes	C	O	x.500	No	Yes
MI	NA	NA	NA	O	INA	P	Yes
MS	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
NE*	A,P	Yes	C	P	NONE	P	Yes
OH	INA	INA	INA	P	LDPA	No	Yes
PA	INA	Yes	C	P	INA	No	INA
UT*	A	Yes	C	INA	LDPA	No	INA
VA*	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA
WA	NA	NA	S	P,O	INA	P	INA

Surveys Not Received to Date:

GA*	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA
ID*	INA	INA	INA	P,O	INA	INA	INA
MA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	P	INA
NY	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA

KEY

- INA = Information Not Available
- NA = Not Applicable
- * States that are contracting out their portal

D. Issues and Concerns

Surveys Received to Date:

	35. Official information privacy policy?	36. Privacy complaints received?	37. Program to address end-user access?	38. Legislature facilitated this project?	39. State agencies supportive?	40. Portal contract re-bid after initial pilot?
AZ*	Implemented	No	NA	NA	Yes	Yes
AR*	No	No	In Planning	Yes	Yes	INA
CA	Implemented	INA	INA	NA	INA	INA
FL	Implemented - Agency Level	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
ID*	No	INA	No	No	No	INA
IA*	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
KS*	INA	No	INA	Yes	Yes	NA
ME*	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	NA
MI	In Planning	INA	In Planning	No	Yes	NA
MS	NA	NA	NA	No	No	NA
NE*	In Planning	No	No	Yes	Yes	NA
OH	In Planning	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	INA
PA	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	INA
UT*	In Planning	No	INA	Yes	Yes	NA
VA*	Implemented	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA
WA	In Planning	No	No	Yes	Yes	NA

Surveys Not Received to Date:

GA*	INA	INA	INA	Yes	INA	INA
IN*	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA	INA
MA	In Planning	INA	INA	No	INA	INA
NY	INA	INA	INA	Yes	INA	INA

KEY

- INA = Information Not Available
- NA = Not Applicable
- * States that are contracting out their portal

Appendix F: State Contacts for Portal Survey Project

(*indicates portals that are contracted outside of state government)

State	Last Name	First Name	Title	Agency	Phone Number	Email address
Arizona* http://servicearizona.ihost.com/	Muir	Chris	Statewide Project Specialist	Government Information Technology Agency	(602) 340-9698 x226	comuir@gita.state.az.us
	Wix	Paul	Planning and Research Manager	Government Information Technology Agency	(602) 340-9698 x216	pawix@gita.state.az.us
Arkansas* http://www.state.ar.us	Chandler	Robert P.	Network Manager	Information Network of Arkansas	(501) 324-8901	robert@ark.org
	Cromwell	Susan	Director, Office of Information Technology	Department of Information Systems	(501) 682-4302	susan.cromwell@mail.state.ar.us
California	Sanders	Scott	Assistant Director of Electronic Tax Administration	Franchise Tax Board	(916) 845-3978	scott_sanders@ftb.ca.gov
	Cortina	Gabriel	Assistant Director	Department of Information Technology	(916) 445-5833	GCortina@doit.ca.gov
	Cortez	Elias S.	Chief Information Officer for the State of California	Department of Information Technology	(916) 445-3050	ecortez@doit.ca.gov
Florida http://fcn.state.fl.us/gsd/	Christopher	Mary	Project Chairman/Director	State Technology Office	(850) 488-8031	christm@dms.state.fl.us
	McMillan	Kim	Operations and Management Consultant	State Technology Office	(850) 488-4494	mcmillk@dms.state.fl.us
Georgia* http://www.ganet.org/	Bostick	Tom	Executive Director	GeorgiaNet Authority	(404) 651-8690	tom@ganet.org
Idaho*	Browne	Miles	Project Manager, Information Technology Division	Department of Administration	(208) 332-1875	Mbrowne@adm.state.id.us
	Farnsworth	Bill	Analyst, Information Technology Resource Management Council	Department of Administration	(208) 332-1878	bfarnsw@adm.state.id.us
Indiana* http://www.state.in.us	Larimer	Laura	Director of Information Technology	Department of Administration	(317) 232-3171	llarimer@doit.state.in.us
	Bradley	Brad	Network General Manager	Access Indiana Information Network	(317) 233-2106	brad@nicusa.com
	Kadlec	Ginger	Director of Marketing	Access Indiana Information Network	(317) 233-8560	gkadlec@ai.org
Iowa* http://www.state.ia.us	Arringdale	David	Planning & Standards Officer	Information Technology Services	(515) 281-5343	dave.arringdale@its.state.ia.us
Kansas* http://www.state.ks.us	Heiman	Don	Director, Division of Information Systems & Communications	Department of Administration	(785) 296-2731	don.heiman@state.ks.us
Maine* http://www.informe.org/	Mayer	Robert	Chief Information Officer, Bureau of Information Services	Department of Administrative & Financial Services	(207) 624-7840	robert.a.mayer@state.me.us
	Cloutier	Mary	Bureau of Information Services	Department of Administrative & Financial Services	(207) 624-7536	mary.cloutier@state.me.us
Massachusetts http://www.state.ma.us/	Kauffman	Sylvia	Senior Policy Analyst, Strategic Planning Group	Information Technology Division	(617) 973-0833	Sylvia.Kauffman@state.ma.us
	Boldman	Claudia	Online Government Coordinator, Strategic Planning Group	Information Technology Division	(617) 973-0857	Claudia.Boldman@state.ma.us

State	Last Name	First Name	Title	Agency	Phone Number	Email address
Michigan http://www.state.mi.us/	Ozols	Andris	Senior Analyst	Department of Management & Budget	(517) 335-1519	OzolsA@state.mi.us
	Boersma	George	Chief Information Officer & Deputy Director, Director's Office	Department of Management & Budget	(517) 373-1006	boersmag@state.mi.us
Mississippi http://www.state.ms.us	Orgeron	Craig	Emerging Technology Coordinator	Department of IT Services	(517) 359-2689	orgeron@its.state.ms.us
Nebraska* http://www.state.ne.us	Henderson	Steven	Deputy Administrator, Information Management Services	Department of Administrative Services	(402) 471-4861	Shenders@notes.state.ne.us
	Conroy	Thomas	Acting Administrator, Intergovernmental Data Services Division	Department of Administrative Services	(402) 471-4348	tconroy@notes.state.ne.us
	Lemon	Greg	Deputy Secretary of the State	Secretary of the State	(402) 471-2554	glemon@mail.state.ne.us
	Armstrong	Rod	General Manager	Nebraska@ Online	(402) 471-6582	rod@nol.org
New York	Campbell	Thomas	Project Director	Office for Technology	(518) 473-5622	tcamp@oft.state.ny.us
	Maxwell	Terry	Executive Director, The NYS Forum for IRM	Rockefeller Institute of Government	(518) 443-5001	TAMaxwell@aol.com
Ohio http://www.state.oh.us/	Theibert	Margaret	Acting Administrator, Office of IS Policy & Planning	Department of Administrative Services	(614) 466-5083	margaret.theibert@das.state.oh.us
	Lane	Betsey		Department of Administrative Services	(614) 728-5623	Betsey.Lane@das.state.oh.us
Pennsylvania http://www.state.pa.us	Hintze	Rhett	Executive Assistant to the Deputy for Information Technology	Governor's Office of Administration/ Office for Information Technology	(717) 705-0350	Rhintze@state.pa.us
Utah* http://www.state.ut.us/	Moon	David	Chief Information Officer	Governor's Office	(801) 538-1066	Dmoon@gov.state.ut.us
	Sherwood	Alan	State Electronic Commerce Coordinator	Governor's Office	(801) 538-1195	asherwoo@gov.state.ut.us
Virginia* www.vipnet.org or www.state.va.us	Houlihan	Dan	General Manager	Virginia Information Providers Network	(804) 786-6201	dan@vipnet.org
	Simonoff	Jerry	Acting Director	Council on Information Management	(804) 225-3622	Jsimonoff@ntp.state.va.us
Washington http://access.wa.gov/	Lim	Erika	Senior Policy Advisor	Department of Information Services	(360) 902-2981	erikal@dis.wa.gov
	Chapman	Scott	Senior Financial and Business Partner, Interactive Technologies	Department of Information Services	(360) 407-0748	scottc@dis.wa.gov
	Parma	Laura	Manager of Interactive Technologies	Department of Information Services	(360) 407-0127	laurap@dis.wa.gov